



JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) - Review of the Revised 2012 National Programmes and on the Future of the DCF (STECF-12-02)

Edited by Paul Connolly & Jarno Virtanen

2012

This report was reviewed by the STECF during its 39th plenary meeting
held from 16 – 20 April 2012, Brussels

Report EUR 25308 EN

European Commission
Joint Research Centre
Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information

STECF secretariat
Address: TP 051, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy
E-mail: stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Tel.: 0039 0332 789343
Fax: 0039 0332 789658

<https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home>
<http://ipsc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>
<http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

Legal Notice

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area.

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union

Freephone number (*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.

It can be accessed through the Europa server <http://europa.eu/>

JRC 70899

EUR 25308 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-24795-8

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/25202

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2012

© European Union, 2012

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Review of the Revised 2012 National Programmes and on the Future of the DCF (STECF-12-02)	5
Terms of Reference.....	5
Introduction.....	5
STECF observations	6
STECF conclusions.....	7
STECF recommendations	8
Expert Working Group report.....	10
1 Executive summary	12
2 Conclusions of the Working Group.....	14
3 Recommendations of the working group.....	16
4 Introduction.....	23
4.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-11-19	24
4.2 Participants	24
5 SECTION 2 - Addressing TOR 1	25
6 SECTION 3 - Addressing TOR 2.....	51
7 SECTION 4 - Addressing TOR 3	63
8 SECTION 5 - Addressing TOR 4.....	69
9 SECTION 6 - Addressing TOR 5.....	75
10 SECTION 7 - Addressing TOR 6.....	76
ANNEX 1 – Terms of Reference.....	77
ANNEX 2 - Meeting Agenda	79
ANNEX 3 - Contact Details for Participants.....	82
ANNEX 4 – List of Key Background Documentation	85
ANNEX 5 – Questions to Assist Review of Revised NP	86

**SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES
(STECF)**

**REVIEW OF THE REVISED 2012 NATIONAL PROGRAMMES AND ON THE FUTURE OF THE DCF
(STECF-12-02)**

**THIS REPORT WAS REVIEWED DURING THE PLENARY MEETING HELD IN
BRUSSELS 16-20 APRIL 2012**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

STECF is requested to review the report of the STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 11-19), evaluate the findings and make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

INTRODUCTION

The Expert Working Group (EWG 11-19) on the Review of National Programmes and the Future of the DCF met in Brussels from 28th November to 1st December 2011 (<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/dcf-dcr>). The Commission received 14 revised 2012 National Programmes. The review assessed each module of the revised NP and determined whether the module contained minor changes, substantial changes or no changes. All revisions were categorised by the EWG and expert opinion was given as to whether a revision was justified and whether it improved the NP.

There is currently great debate on scope and format of the new DCF. In order to inform this debate, the meeting reviewed the SWOT analysis carried out by EWG 11-02 in March 2011. The approach taken was to undertake a brainstorm session on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities of the DCF.

Two major data end users of DCF data (ICES and GFCM) presented their views on data issues and the DCF. They explained that objectives of the new DCF must be linked with the objectives of a reformed CFP, integrated with other policies such as the MSFD and the Habitats Directive and also linked with the objectives of the RFMO's. There must also be more emphasis on ecosystem aspects such as biodiversity and ecosystem health and functioning and to fisheries approaches (as opposed to fish stock approaches). Socio economic aspects must also be better integrated. The new DCF should also consider a more regional approach, more efficient stratification, better data access, reduced observer bias and adapt to new conditions while maintaining time series. The New DCF must address the data access issue and improve access for advisers, scientists and public debate. There will also be a requirement to look at new data

types related to biodiversity, food webs (e.g. new stomach data) and habitat impacts (e.g. multi-purpose TV surveys).

There were two specific recommendations from the 8th Liaison Meeting that were addressed by EWG 11-19 (<http://www.dcf-germany.de/fileadmin/sites/default/downloads/>). These related to an apparent conflict in the recommendations from the RCM Baltic and RCM North Atlantic (Recommendation LM 6 and LM 28); the issue of concurrent sampling (Recommendation LM 24) and metier variables, regional ranking (Recommendation LM 44). The dedicated workshop on concurrent sampling (WKISCON, ICES 2008) recalled the original idea that concurrent length sampling of landings ashore could be considered as a supplement to sampling at sea, and be combined with sampling of length compositions of the retained catches sampled at sea where appropriate. The EWG acknowledged the fact that concurrent sampling on-shore faced implementation difficulties leading to modification of the scheme as defined in the Commission Decision or impossibility to sample concurrently. This situation is different from on-board sampling, where concurrent sampling still remains the rule and the code of good practice.

STECF OBSERVATIONS

STECF notes that several NPs were not submitted to the Commission for review and may contain (minor) revisions that have not been evaluated.

STECF notes that the changes in the revised NP assessed by EWG 11-19 were mostly minor except for module 3 (Evaluation of the fishing sector) where there were some major and unacceptable revisions. Only in a few cases was the group able to evaluate the financial implications of modifications in the NP.

STECF notes that some MS do not follow the current guidelines and recommendations from the RCMs and follow up by MS should be presented in the different sections on regional coordination of the NP and not as one combined list in the report. Moreover not all MS follow the guidelines that revisions made to the original text of the NP should be highlighted in red to facilitate review of the changes.

STECF notes that several of the conclusions and recommendation of EWG 11-19 were taken up in EWG 12-01 on the revision of the DCF.

STECF notes that in the present proposal from the Commission on the Common Fisheries Policy discard bans may be one of the new important elements. Such bans will of course affect the kind of data that sea-sampling programmes can provide as fishermen may change their fishing patterns and be required to retain and land all bycatches.

STECF notes that on the issue of analysis to merge metiers, some MS have put considerable effort into describing and analysing their metiers in order to merge them for sampling purposes. The Lot 2 project has also been finalised recently (see also Deporte et al. 2012).

STECF notes that the organisation of RCM recommendations in the NP is an issue that needs to be discussed when the guidelines are updated. Potentially, all RCM recommendations and actions following them could be presented in one list.

STECF CONCLUSIONS

STECF concludes that the contents of the National Programmes could be enhanced if:

- all MS follow the guidelines for the National Programme.
- all the adjustments carried out by MS were clearly reported to illustrate the activities implemented in the reference year (i.e the reference year in the 2012 report is 2011).
- revisions in the text of the NP proposals within the programme period were done in a way allowing the reader to follow the development in the MS. For example, the report for year three of the three-year programme, should retain all information valid for the first two years. This could easily be accommodated by leaving in tracked changes.
- all MS performing the ranking system would use the average values of the 2 previous years and if MS would use the most updated set of values (i.e. landing values, tons, fishing days) in order to select the métiers to be sampled.
- all MS would list the most recent recommendations (from SGRN, SGECA, STECF, RCM, Liaison meeting) and report the actions taken by the MS.
- RCM recommendations that the MS already have acted upon were not deleted when MS revise their NP within the programme period.
- MS which applied for derogation to exclude certain metiers from their sampling programme, would take into account the regional context in their rationale.

STECF concludes that in general the quality of the NP is adequate, but that there is still room for improvement both on the quality of the NP and on the transparency of the adjustments. The EWG was not confident, however, that they reviewed all adjustments, because it was not clear whether the NP that were not received had been adjusted.

STECF concludes that MS should continue to sample all metiers selected by ranking according to the DCF and be sure to cover all the species/stocks where a demand is formulated by an end-user (or listed in Appendix VII of the Comm. Dec.). The methodology used to achieve the goals remains at the discretion of the MS, provided that it is fully documented and approved within their NP proposal.

STECF concludes that the renewed DCF should address the indicators of the MSFD to be able to improve the implementation of the ecosystem based approach to fisheries management.

STECF concludes that important knowledge has been gained in the study mentioned above on statistical methods for identifying and prediction métiers from logbooks data. However, it is too early to state that the methods are suitable for all countries and fishing activities. MS should start to work with the tools developed within the study and the outcomes of the analysis should then be contrasted with the results from the routine analysis. Experience could then be brought to the training course planned by ICES ('Analysing and visualisation of VMS and EU logbook data using the VMStools R-package' 25th-29th of June 2012).

STECF concludes that the timing of the Liaison Meeting (LM) should be changed. The LM recommendations are not channelled to the MS in due time as the LM is scheduled right after the RCM with the result that the LM lacks complete RCM reports to review and LM is unable to judge final recommendations by the RCM. LM should provide a final list of recommendations for inclusion in the NP, rather than MS using the unofficial lists of recommendations by the RCM.

In view of the current process of the revision of the DCF STECF concludes that:

- the role of the sea-sampling programmes within a possible future regime of discard ban should be thoroughly discussed within the revision process of the DCF.
- the review of the SWOT analysis of EWG 11-02 was very productive and created very useful results to inform the future EWG on the revision of the DCF.
- the issues raised during the DCF brainstorm session (list of 46) should be used to inform the debate on the new DCF. The focus should be on addressing these issues rather than identifying new issues.

STECF RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to facilitate enhancements in the NPs, STECF recommends that the Commission should:

- include in the guidelines definitions of minor, major, or substantial changes (e.g. methodological issues, sampling design, changing in the surveys, derogations etc etc).
- request all MS to include a summary page giving a brief overview of the main revision made to the NP.
- publish the list of all relevant recommendations from STECF, RCM, Liaison meetings in the data collection web site.

STECF recommends that the Commission provide to the NP review group, the original text and the proposed NP revisions for ease of comparison. The final version of the approved NP is what should appear on the DCF website. This website is currently not up to date.

EXPERT WORKING GROUP REPORT

REPORT TO THE STECF

**Expert Working Group on Review of the Revised 2012
National Programmes and on the Future of the DCF (EWG-
11-19)**

**Borchette Centre, Brussels;
28th November to 1st December 20112012**

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the STECF and the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area

“ we cannot solve problems by using the same kind of
thinking we used when we created them “

Albert Einstein

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 11-19) on the Review of National Programmes and the Future of the DCF met at the Borchette Centre, Brussels from 28th November to 1st December 2011. The terms of reference for the EWG are given in annex 1 and the agenda is given in annex 2. The expert group worked through a series of Sub Groups, presentations and plenary discussions. The main conclusions and recommendations from the meeting are given in the section that immediately follows this executive summary.

The Commission received 14 revised 2012 National Programmes. These were reviewed in four Sub groups. Each Sub Group reviewed their respective NP's using the guidance template shown in Annex 5. The review assessed each module of the revised NP and determined whether the module contained minor changes, substantial changes or no changes. Any revisions were described by the review group and expert opinion was given as to whether a revision was justified and whether it improved the NP. The review group also gave expert opinion as to whether any revisions were acceptable. The review groups gave general comments on issues that emerged during their discussions of the revised NP's and proposed recommendations on how to improve any issues identified. The results of the review of the revised NP are summarized in Table 2.1. Some key comments arising from the review are summarized. Many of these comments can be addressed in a review of the guidelines for submission of NP.

Twenty One issues were identified that need to be addressed in future NP, AR and in the revision to the guidelines for submission of NP. These included the need for MS to explain new methodology; deletion of information from the original tri-annual programme; MS inconsistent handling of RCM recommendations; importance of derogations at regional level; discard ban and impact on sampling; use of LOT project results by MS in NP; unilateral action by MS on altering their surveys; need to improve DCF website; MS non adherence to guidelines; non use of species scientific names; timing of RCM and LM; difficulty in tracking adjustments made in NP; need for a recommendations data base.

One key issue that emerged in the review centered on NP that had not been submitted to the Commission for review. The NP may contain revisions that have not been evaluated. In order to address this issue, a clear set of rules needs to be established by the Commission regarding the submission of revised NP and what constitutes a "minor" or "major" revision to a NP. EWG 11-19 recommends that for the Annual Report 2013, all the adjustments carried out by Member states must be clearly reported to illustrate the activities implemented in the reference year. All these adjustments should then appear in the relevant tables of the Annual Report (See Recommendations).

There is currently great debate on scope and format of the new DCF. In order to inform this debate, the meeting reviewed the SWOT analysis carried out by EWG Group 11-02 in April 2011 (see table 3.2). The approach taken was to undertake a brainstorm session on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities of the DCF. The objective of this approach was to collate ideas that inform the debate and guide possible changes to the post 2013 DCF. In a very productive discussion session (over two hours), the invited experts and the Commission engaged and expressed their views on the current DCF and its future needs, in a changing policy landscape (see conclusions for the list of issues raised). The discussion was kept at a high level to avoid the meeting getting bogged down in technical detail. Chatham House Rules were applied in that this report gives no indication of who said what. It should be emphasised here that the points expressed at the brainstorming session do not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission nor the EWG.

Two major data end users of DCF data (ICES and GFCM) presented their views on data issues and the DCF. The objectives of the new DCF must be linked with the objectives of a reformed CFP, integrated with other policies such as the MSFD and the Habitats Directive and also linked with the objectives of the RFMO's. There must also be more emphasis on ecosystem aspects such as biodiversity and ecosystem health and functioning and to fisheries approaches (as opposed to fish stock approaches). Socio economic aspects must also be better integrated. The new DCF should also consider a more regional approach, more efficient stratification, better data access, reduced observer bias and adapt to new conditions while maintaining time series. The New DCF must address the data access issue and improve access for advisers, scientists and public debate. There will also be a requirement to look at new data types related to biodiversity, food webs (e.g. new stomach data) and habitat impacts (e.g. multi purpose TV surveys).

The group reviewed the comments and recommendations made by STECF during their plenary meetings in 2011, in relation to the new DCF. The group also discussed data deficiencies and how new species/deep sea species could be better integrated into the current sampling frame. The approach taken by the group was to develop a table of the key comments and recommendations made by STECF in relation to the revision of the DCF. The group recognized that 2012 will be a critical year in establishing the new DCF and that this table should be consulted by the Commission (and others) to ensure that key issues are incorporated into discussions on the new DCF. Following feedback from the Commission, the group concluded that the issue of data requirements for new species and deep water species should be an integral part of the data end user feedback in the DCF review (driven by data end users and not data collectors).

There were two specific recommendations from the 8th LM that were addressed to EWG 11-19. These related to an apparent conflict in the recommendations from the RCM Baltic and RCM North Atlantic (Recommendation LM 6 and LM 28); RCM Baltic and RCM NA both proposed a procedure to identify where bilateral agreements on sampling of foreign landings have to be set up. RCM NA reflecting on the issue after RCM Baltic had a different view, but it appeared that the rule proposed by RCM Baltic was set for the biological parameters whereas the rules set by RCM NA would apply to métier related variables. On the issue of concurrent sampling (Recommendation LM 24), the dedicated workshop on concurrent sampling (WKISCON, ICES 2008) recalled the original idea that concurrent length sampling of landings ashore could be considered as a supplement to sampling at sea, and [could] be combined with sampling of length compositions of the retained catches sampled at sea where appropriate. STECF/EWG acknowledges the fact that concurrent sampling on-shore faced implementation difficulties leading to accommodation of the scheme as defined in the Commission Decision or impossibility to sample concurrently. This situation is different from on-board sampling, where concurrent sampling still remains the rule and the code of good practice. In conclusion, for on-shore sampling, this EWG is of the opinion that MS should continue to sample the métiers and make sure to cover all the species/stocks where a demand is formulated by an end-user (or listed in Appendix VII of the Comm. Dec.), but the methodology used to achieve the goals remains at the discretion of the MS, provided that it is fully documented and approved within their NP proposal.

ICES gave the group an update on progress in relation to the Regional Data base (RDB). The RDB Steering Group were to meet the following day in Brussels to address various issues and map out a work programme for 2012. EWG 11-19 strongly supports the current work on the RDB and emphasized the importance of the RDB to the DCF.

The group developed a proposed schedule of DCF EWG meetings for 2012, with emphasis on the new DCF, review of AR and the NP 2013. This list will be made available before this report is completed so that it can be used by STECF and the Commission in developing the meeting schedule for 2012.

At the end of the meeting the group reviewed its TOR's and concluded each TOR had been addressed and where possible, clear conclusions and recommendations made.

2 CONCLUSIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP

Conclusions from TOR 1

Review of Revised NP

The review assessed each module of the revised NP and determined whether the module contained minor changes, substantial changes or no changes. Most revisions were minor except for module 3 (Evaluation of the fishing sector) where there were some major and unacceptable revisions. Generally the revised NPs present few and minor changes. Only in few cases was it possible to evaluate the financial implications of these modifications. One key issue identified for action was the unilateral revision of survey design. The review groups have given general comments on issues that emerged during their discussions of the revised NP's and proposed recommendations on how to improve any issues identified. One key issue that emerged during discussions of the revised NP centered on NP that had not been submitted to the Commission for review. These NP may contain minor revisions that have not been evaluated. To address this issue, a suggested approach is that all MS must submit their NP and state whether there are revisions or no revisions to the NP. The results of the review of the revised NP are summarized in Table 2.1. Some key comments arising from the review are summarized. Some of these comments can be addressed in a review of the guidelines for submission of NP.

Conclusions from TOR 2

Update SWOT on New DCF

The SWOT analysis carried out by EWG Group 11-02 in April 2011 was updated. The approach taken was to undertake a brainstorm session on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities of the DCF. The objective of this approach was to collate ideas that inform the debate and guide possible changes to the post 2013 DCF. In a very productive discussion session (over two hours), the invited experts and the Commission engaged and expressed their views on the current DCF and its future needs, in a changing policy landscape. The discussions were kept at a high level to avoid the meeting getting bogged down in technical detail. A total of 46 key points were identified that need to be addressed in discussions on the new DCF. This material was then used to update the SWOT carried out in April 2011 (See Table 3.1 and Table 3.2).

Conclusions from TOR 3

Review Comments made by STECF on New DCF

The group reviewed the comments and recommendations made by STECF during their plenary meetings in 2011, in relation to these EWG's with a focus on the new DCF. The approach taken by the group was to develop a table of the key comments and recommendations made by STECF in relation to the revision of the DCF. The group recognized that 2012 will be a critical year in establishing the new DCF and that this table should be consulted by the Commission (and others) to ensure that key issues are incorporated into discussions on the new DCF.

Following feedback from the Commission, the group concluded that the issue of data requirements for new species and deep water species should be an integral part of the data end user feedback in the DCF review (driven by data end users and not data collectors).

Conclusions from TOR 4

Comments made by RCM and LM

Concurrent Sampling -The dedicated workshop on concurrent sampling (WKISCON, ICES 2008) recalled the original idea that concurrent length sampling of landings ashore could be considered as a supplement to sampling at sea, and [could] be combined with sampling of length compositions of the retained catches sampled at sea where appropriate. STECF/EWG acknowledges the fact that concurrent sampling on-shore faced implementation difficulties leading to accommodation of the scheme as defined in the Commission Decision or impossibility to sample concurrently. This situation is different from on-board sampling, where concurrent sampling still remains the rule and the code of good practice. In conclusion, for on-shore sampling, this EWG is of the opinion that MS should continue to sample the metiers and make sure to cover all the species/stocks where a demand is formulated by an end-user (or listed in Appendix VII of the Comm. Dec.), but the methodology used to achieve the goals remains at the discretion of the MS, provided that it is fully documented and approved within their NP proposal.

Conclusions from TOR 5

Update on Regional Data Base

ICES gave a brief overview of progress in relation to the RDB. EWG 11-19 thanks ICES for the update and commended the progress made. The group strongly supports the current work on the RDB and emphasized the importance of the RDB to the DCF.

Conclusions from TOR 6

Proposed Schedule of DCF EWG Meetings in 2012

A proposed schedule of STECF EWG meetings was developed for 2012 to address routine DCF issues (review of AR, NP) and to address the revision of the DCF. The proposed schedule will be considered by STECF when they develop their work programme for 2012.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP

Recommendations from TOR 1

Review of Revised 2012 National Programmes

1. Annual Reports 2013 – Reporting of Adjustments to NP	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that for Annual Report 2013, all the adjustments carried out by MSs must be clearly reported to illustrate the activities implemented in the reference year. This rule has to be applied to all kind of adjustments (minor, major, substantial etc etc) even in case MS have submitted or not a revised version of the National Program. All these “adjustments” should then appear in the relevant tables of the Annual Report Changes in AR tables with respect to the NP tables should be tracked in red.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF, MEMBER STATES, DATA END USERS
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

2. Metier Ranking System	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	According to Commission Decision 93/2010, all MS performing the ranking system should use the average values of the 2 previous years. EWG 11-19 recommends that MS (even if they submitted or not a revised version of the National Program) use the most update set of values (i.e. landing values, tons, fishing days) in order to select the métiers to be sampled.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF, MEMBER STATES, DATA END USERS
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

3. Addressing RCM Recommendations	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that any revision of the NP should include recommendations from RCMs. However, the group considers that in some cases these recommendations refer to minor adjustments in the sampling scheme with no impact on the budget forecast. In all these cases, the MS should be aware that they can adjust the NP by simply

	reporting the adjustments in the Annual Report.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

4. Addressing Recommendations – Guidance from Commission	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that the Commission should clarify if major changes in the NP - such as methodological revisions and changes in the design of a survey – can be undertaken and, if yes, the Commission should provide to MS with clear procedures. The Commission should also specify what are considered minor, major, or substantial changes (methodological issues, sampling design, changing in the surveys, derogations etc etc). All the most update recommendations (from SGRN, SGECA, STECF, RCM, Liaison meeting) have to be listed in the Annual report and the actions taken by the MS should be reported. The group recommends the Commission to publish the list of all relevant recommendations in the data collection web site in order to facilitate this reporting activity.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

5. On the revision of the National Programmes within a Programme Period	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that revisions in the text of the NP proposals within the programme period should be done in a way allowing the reader to follow the development in the MS. This means that all information valid for the first years of the triannual programme should be kept and not deleted. For example, if a pilot study was carried out in 2011 and the NP for 2012 was revised in accordance with the result from the pilot study, information about the pilot study should be kept in the text of the NP, specifying that this was the situation in 2011, and description of the related modifications should be added, specifying that this

	was the revised situation for 2012.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF, Member States
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

6. Follow up of RCM Recommendations	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 noted that the handling of RCM recommendations in NP proposals differ between MS. In accordance with the present guidelines recommendations from the RCMs and follow up by MS should be presented in the different sections on regional coordination of the NP and not as one combined list in the report. EWG 11-19 recommends that all RCM recommendations and actions following them could be presented in one list. This issue needs to be discussed when the guidelines are updated. RCM recommendations that the MS already have acted upon should not be deleted when MS revise their NP <i>within</i> the programme period.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

7. MS seeking Derogation from Sampling certain Metiers	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that when MS apply for derogation to sample certain metiers, it is of importance that the derogation is also put in a regional context. What is the importance of the metier in the regional view? Has RCM concluded that sampling is well covered by other countries? This kind of information is usually compiled in the RCM reports, and should be included in the NP proposal allowing the EWG to judge the potential consequences of a derogation. This issue should be addressed in the review of guidelines.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

8. Impact of Ban on Discarding on Sea Sampling	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	On the issue of sea-sampling within a regime of high-grading or discard ban; such bans will affect the discard patterns in certain fisheries and is likely increase/introduce an observer effect. In the present proposal from the Commission on a new Common Fisheries Policy discard bans is one of the new important elements. Such bans will of cause affect the kind of data that sea-sampling programmes can provide. EWG 11-19 recommends that the role of the sea-sampling programmes within a possible future regime of discard ban is thoroughly discussed within the revision process of the DCF.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

9 Use of LOT Project Results	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 notes that On the issue of analysis to merge metiers some MS have put considerable effort into describe and analyse their metiers in order to merge them for sampling purposes. The Lot2 (Comparative investigation of statistical methods for identifying and prediction métiers from logbooks data. A workflow applied to the international otter trawl fisheries in the North Sea) project have also been finalised. It is of importance that knowledge gained in the “Lot” projects intended to increase quality in data collection is transferred to non partner MS as well. It is too early to state that the methods for identifying metiers in logbook data developed by the Lot 2 project is suitable to all countries and fisheries but MS need to gain experience in order to assess the usefulness. EWG 11-19 recommends that MS start to work with the tools developed within Lot 2 to gain experience. The outcomes of the analysis should then be contrasted with the results from the routine analysis. Experience could then be brought to the training course planned by ICES (25 th -29 th of June 2012).
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April

	2012
--	------

10 Revision of Guidelines for Submission of NP	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 notes that the guidelines for the provision of the revised NP state that revisions made to the original text of the NP should be highlighted in red to facilitate review of the changes. The guidelines should be updated to reflect the request to highlight revisions to NP text as track changes. Revisions to Tables should be highlighted in red, and the previous text and tables should be made available to the review group, by the Commission for ease of comparison. The final version of the approved NP is what should appear on the DCF website – this needs to be updated. EWG 11-19 recommends that the updated guidelines should request all MS to include a summary page giving a brief overview of the main revision made to the NP.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

11. Timing of the LM and RCM	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that the timing of the LM is changed. The LM recommendations are not channeled to the MS in due time as the LM is scheduled right after the RCM's with the result that the LM lacks complete RCM reports to review and LM is unable to judge final recommendations by the RCMs. LM should provide a final list of recommendations for inclusion in the NPs, rather than MS taking over the unofficial lists of recommendations by the RCMs.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

12. Future DCF

EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that for the Future <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An “Annual Working Plan” from all MS with the most update data set 2. A revised version of the NP (independently from the changes occurred) each MS will specify/highlight in a separate box the changes made to the NP. The Commission will decide if these changes are minor, major substantial and the NP will follow a different “road” on the basis of the modification occurred. 3. If the changes are minor (to be defined by the Commission...) all these will appear only in the AR, and MS are not obliged to re-submit the NP. MS that will have substantial changes should resubmit the NP.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

1. Unilateral action by MS to Change Survey Design	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	Regarding coordinated international research surveys, unilateral actions by MS may undermine the international cooperation within the DCF. MS are reminded that the DCF survey list is not open for new surveys. EWG 11-19 recommends that possible implications of the proposed changes in surveys put forward by any MS need to be discussed by STECF before they can be approved.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

**Recommendations from TOR 2
Update SWOT on New DCF**

2. Issues identified from a Brainstorm of the DCF	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that the issues raised during the DCF brainstorm session (list of 46) should be used to inform the debate on the new DCF. The focus should be on addressing these

	issues rather than identifying new issues.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF, MEMBER STATES, DATA END USERS
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

3. Updated SWOT on DCF	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that the updated SWOT analyses (Table 3.2) should be used to inform the debate on the new DCF. The focus should be on addressing the issues in the SWOT rather than identifying new issues.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF, MEMBER STATES, DATA END USERS
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

Recommendations from TOR 3

Review Comments made by STECF on New DCF

16. STECF Comments and Recommendations on new DCF	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that the 18 issues outlined in the Table 4.1 of this report are included in the discussion on a new DCF during the early part of 2012.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF, MEMBER STATES, DATA END USERS
Time Frame	During early 2012 after STECF Plenary April 2012

Recommendations from TOR 4

Comments made by RCM and LM

17. Concurrent Sampling	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	EWG 11-19 recommends that for on-shore sampling, MS should continue to sample the metiers and make sure to cover all the species/stocks where a demand is formulated by an end-user (or listed in Appendix VII of the Comm. Dec.), but the methodology used to achieve the goals remains at the discretion of the MS, provided that it is fully documented and approved within

	their NP proposal.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF, MEMBER STATES, DATA END USERS
Time Frame	During early 2012 After STECF Plenary April 2012

Recommendations from TOR 5

Update on Regional Data Base

There were no specific recommendations from EWG 11-19 on this TOR.

Recommendations from TOR 6

Proposed Schedule of DCF EWG Meetings in 2012

18. STECF EWG Meeting Schedule 2012 for DCF	
EWG 11-19 Recommendation :	A proposed schedule of STECF EWG meetings was developed for 2012 to address routine DCF issues (review of AR, NP) and to address the revision of the DCF (Table 7.1) . EWG 11-19 recommends that the oposed schedule be considered by STECF when they develop their meeting programme for 2012.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Await Review by STECF Plenary in April 2012
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE , STECF,
Time Frame	During early 2012 After STECF Plenary April 2012

4 INTRODUCTION

EWG 11-19 met at the Borchette Centre Brussels from 28th November to 1st December 2011 to review the revisions to Member States 2012 National Programmes. The Group also discussed the issues in relation to the post 2013 DCF. The terms of Reference and agenda for the meeting are given in Annex 1 and 2. The meeting roadmap is given in Annex 7.

The main business of the group focused on reviewing the revised 2012 NP and on the new DCF. There is currently great debate in the Commission and within and between MS on the scope and format of the new DCF . In order to inform this debate, the Group updated the DCF SWOT carried out in April 2011 and compiled a list of recent STECF recommendations and comments in relation to the new DCF. **This material will greatly facilitate discussions on the new DCF.** The group also addressed some issues referred to it by the 8th LM and proposed a schedule of DCF meetings for 2012.

4.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-11-19

Terms of reference for the expert working group is given in annex 1.

4.2 Participants

The following experts participated at the meeting (see Annex 3 for contact details).

Invited experts

ARMESTO, Angeles;
CARPENTIERI, Paolo;
CONNOLLY, Paul (Chair);
DALSKOV, Jorgen;
DIAS, Marina;
EBELING, Michael;
GOTI, Leyre;
GRAVINO, Francesca;
JUNG, Armelle;
KAZLAUSKAS, Edvardas;
KOUTRAKIS, Emmanuil;
LESKELA, Ari;
NI CHONCHUIR, Grainne;
RADU, Gheorghe;
DAID, Tiit;
RINGDAHL, Katja;
SCHON, Pieter-Jan;
STATKUS, Romas;
STROIE, Constantin;
TORREELE, Els;
VASSALLO, Darcelle;
VERVER, Sieto;
VIGNEAU, Joel;
WOJCIK, Ireneusz;

JRC expert

VIRTANEN Jarno

Observers

DENGBOL, Paol (ICES)
HOLDSWORTH, Neil (ICES)
De ROSSI, Federico (GFCM)

EU Commission

RANNER, Herwig (DG MARES)
KAPP, Amelie (DG MARES)

5 SECTION 2 - ADDRESSING TOR 1

Review of the Revised 2012 National Programmes

TOR 1. Evaluation of the Revised 2012 National Programmes.

To evaluate the 2012 National Programmes (NP) submitted under the new Data Collection Framework (Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008) using the new Guidelines and Procedures developed in SGRN 09-03. The evaluation will be based on the overarching criteria of conformity and scientific relevance. It will also consider the performance of the guidelines for submission of NPs and, where necessary, make appropriate recommendations for their improvement. The 2011 to 2013 NP have already been evaluated (SGRN 10-01) and this review will focus on revisions made by MS to the original programmes.

The Commission received 14 revised 2012 National Programmes. These were reviewed by EWG 11-19 in the following four Sub groups.

- Sub Group 1 – Economic Modules (including Trans. Var.)
- Sub Group 2 – Denmark, Ireland, Malta, Portugal, UK
- Sub group 3 – Spain, Lithuania, Poland, Romania
- Sub Group 4 – Germany, France, Netherlands, Sweden, Slovenia

Each Sub Group reviewed their respective NP's using the template shown in Annex 6. Each Sub Group was supplied with a guidance spreadsheet (see figure 2.1). The review assessed each module of the revised NP and determined whether the module contained minor changes, substantial changes or no changes. Any revisions were described by the review group and expert opinion was given as to whether a revision was justified and whether it improved the NP. The review group also gave expert opinion as to whether any revisions were acceptable.

Finally, the review groups gave general comments on issues that emerged during their discussions of the revised NP's and proposed recommendations on how to improve any issues identified.

One key issue that emerged during discussions of the revised NP centered on NP that had not been submitted to the Commission for review. These NP may contain minor revisions that have not been evaluated. To address this issue, a suggested approach is that all MS must submit their NP and state whether there are revisions or no revisions to the NP.

The results of the review of the revised NP are summarized in Table 2.1. Some key comments arising from the review are summarized. Some of these comments can be addressed in a review of the guidelines for submission of NP.

Table 2.1

STECF EWG 11-19 - Review of Member States NP's - MASTER COPY

MODULE	BEL	BUL	CYP	DEN	EST	FIN	FRA	GER	GRE*	IRL	ITA	LAT	LIT	MAL	NET	POL	POR	ROM	SLO	SPA	SWE	UK
OVERALL COMPLIANCE																						
I General Framework				NC			M	M		NC			NA	NC	M	NA	NC		M	M	M	NC
II National Data Collection Organisation				M			M	M		NC			M	NC	M	M	NC	M	M	M	S	NC
III Evaluation of the Fishing Sector				M			M	M		M			S	S	S	S	S		M	S	S	S
IV Economics of Aquaculture and Processing				M			M	M		M			M	M	M	NC	NC	M	NC	M	M	M
V Fishing Effects on Marine ecosystems				NC			M	M		NC			NC	NC	M	NC	NC		M	NC	M	NC
VI Management and Use of Data				NC			S	M		NC			NC	NC	M	NC	NC		M	NC	M	NC
VII Follow Up STECF Recommendations				M			M	M		M			NR		M	NR	NC		M	NR	M	NC
VIII List of derogations				M			M	M		NC			NC	NC	M	M	NC		M	NC	M	NC
IX List of Acronyms and Abbreviations				NC			NC	NC		NC			NC	NC	M	NC	NC		M	NC	M	NC
X Comments, Suggestions, Reflections				NC			NC	NC		NC			NC	NC	M	NC	NC		M	NC	M	NC
XI References				NC			NC	NC		NC			NC	NC	NC	NC	NC		M	M	M	NC
XII Annexes				NC			NC	NC		NC			M	NC	NC	M	NC		M	M	M	NC

Note: Module VIII changed to list of derogations

No Revised NP Submitted

M
M
S
NC
NR

Minor changes, with comments by subgroup

Minor changes, no comments by subgroup

Substantial changes with comments by subgroup

No changes

Not reviewed as recommendations were not distributed

Not possible to review as no revised plan was submitted

NOTE: This is a summary on a module by module basis. The final review is based on the “worst case” in the module sub areas.

Some Key Comments and Recommendations arising out of the NP reviews

(1). In the case when MS made substantial changes in NP economic data collection methodology, it could be acceptable only when an improved methodology is clearly explained in the NP text.

(2). In the economic module, there was a demand to accept a methodological change on the clustering of vessels that shift between two fishing techniques during the year in an equal proportion. This issue could be solved by using the fishing effort average during several previous years.

(3). EWG 11-19 recommends that revisions in the text of the NP proposals within the programme period should be done in a way allowing the reader to follow the development in the MS. This means that all information valid for the first years of the triannual programme should be kept and not deleted.

(4). The handling of RCM recommendations in NP proposals differ between MS which has an effect on the consistency of all NPs and may impact the review process in the EWG. In accordance with the present guidelines recommendations from the RCMs and follow up by MS should be presented in the different sections on regional coordination of the NP and not as one combined list in the report. However different MS are dealing with this differently and it may be more clear if all RCM recommendations and actions following them could be presented in one list. **EWG 11-19 recommends that this issue needs to be discussed when the guidelines are updated.**

(5). EWG 11-19 recommends that when MS apply for derogation to sample certain metiers, it is of importance that the derogation is also put in a regional context. What is the importance of the metier in the regional view? Has RCM concluded that sampling is well covered by other countries? This kind of information is usually compiled in the RCM reports, and should be included in the NP proposal allowing the EWG to judge the potential consequences of a derogation.

(6). Bans on high-grading for certain species and areas have in recent years been included in the EU legislation. Such bans will affect the discard patterns in certain fisheries and is likely increase/introduce an observer effect. In the proposals for revisions in the NP there are examples of a MS abandon sea-sampling in a certain fishery as a consequence of a high-grading ban. In the present proposal from the Commission on a new Common Fisheries Policy discard bans is one of the new important elements. Such bans will impact the kind of data that sea-sampling programmes can provide. **EWG 11-19 recommends that the role of the sea-sampling programmes within a possible future regime of discard ban is thoroughly discussed within the revision process of the DCF.**

(7). Some MS have put considerable effort into describe and analyse their metiers in order to merge them for sampling purposes. The Lot2 “Comparative investigation of statistical methods for identifying and prediction métiers from logbooks data. A workflow applied to the international otter trawl fisheries in the North Sea” project have also been finalised. It is of importance that knowledge gained in the “lot” projects intended to increase quality in data collection is transferred to non partner MS as well. **EWG 11-19 recommends that MS start to work with the tools developed within Lot 2 to gain experience. The outcomes of the analysis should then be contrasted with the results from the routine analysis. Experience could then be brought to the training course planned by ICES (25th-29th of June 2012).**

(8). Regarding coordinated international research surveys, unilateral actions by MS may undermine the international cooperation within the DCF. MS are reminded that the DCF survey list is not open for new surveys. **EWG 11-19 recommends that possible implications of the proposed changes in surveys put forward by the UK need to be discussed by STECF before they can be approved.**

(9). The guidelines for the provision of the revised National Programmes state that revisions made to the original text of the National Programme should be highlighted in red to facilitate review of the changes. **EWG 11-19 recommends that the guidelines should be updated to reflect the request to highlight revisions to NP text as track changes.** Revisions to Tables should be highlighted in red, and the previous text and tables should be made available to the review group, by the Commission for ease of comparison. It is recommended that the updated guidelines should request all MS to include a summary page giving a brief overview of the main revision made to the NP.

(10). **EWG 11-19 recommends that the final version of the approved NP is what should appear on the DCF website – this needs to be updated.**

(11). The National Programmes are submitted as a multiannual programme. The current programme 2011-2013 is based on the reference period 2007-2008, as recommended by the Liaison Meeting. Changing the reference period may have a huge impact on the selection of métiers and may have an impact on regional aspects with regard to sampling coverage. There is also the opinion that NP should be based on the most up to date reference years, which implies in most cases, that MS NP submissions will need to be revised annually.

(12). Member states are reminded to adhere to the updated guidelines. In some cases, review by the subgroup was not possible as changes were not highlighted. Moreover, changes to tables are difficult to review when MS use national colour-coding within their tables. MS are reminded to tidy up tables and only highlight or colour cells that were revised. Also, MS should refrain from adding national comments alongside the standard tables.

(13). As described in the guidelines, MS are reminded to use scientific species names throughout the Programme.

(14). Some MS did not include the list of eligible meetings as this list was not circulated in time before the submission.

(15). Some MS did not include the list of STECF or LM recommendations as these lists were not circulated in time before submission. Given that these lists were not equally available to all MS at the same time, these parts of the revised NP's can't be evaluated properly. **EWG 11-19 recommends that the the timing of the LM needs reconsideration as the LM recommendations are not channelled to the MS in due time. Moreover, as LM is scheduled right after the RCM's, LM lacks complete RCM reports to review and LM is unable to judge final recommendations by the RCMs. LM should provide a final list of recommendations for inclusion in the NPs, rather than MS taking over the unofficial lists of recommendations by the RCMs.**

(16). **EWG 11-19 recommends that for the Annual Report 2012 (May 2013), all the adjustments carried out by MSs must be clearly reported in the Annual Report to illustrate the activities implemented in the reference year.** This rule has to be applied to all kind of adjustments (minor, major, substantial etc etc) even in cases where MS have submitted or not a revised version of the National Program. All these "adjustments" should then appear in the relevant tables of the Annual Report. Changes in AR tables with respect to the NP tables should be tracked in red.

(17). A revised version of the NP (independently from the changes occurred) each MS will specify/highlight in a separate box the changes made to the NP. The Commission will decide if these

changes are minor, major substantial and the NP will follow a different “road” on the basis of the modification occurred.

(18). According to Commission Decision 93/2010, all MS performing the ranking system should use the average values of the 2 previous years. **EWG 11-19 recommends that MS (even they submitted or not a revised version of the National Program) use the most update set of values (i.e. landing values, tons, fishing days) in order to select the métiers to be sampled.**

(19). A revision of the NP should include recommendations from RCMs. However, the group considers that in some cases these recommendations refer to minor adjustments in the sampling scheme with no impact on the budget forecast. In all these cases, the MS should be aware that they can adjust the NP by simply reporting the adjustments in the Annual Report.

(20). The Commission should clarify if major changes in the NP - such as methodological revisions and changes in the design of a survey – can be undertaken and, if yes, the Commission should provide to MS clear procedures. The Commission should also specify what are considered minor, major, or substantial changes (methodological issues, sampling design, changing in the surveys, derogations etc etc).

(21). All the most update recommendations (from SGRN, SGECA, STECF, RCM, Liaison meeting) have to be listed in the Annual report and the actions taken by the MS should be reported. The group recommends the Commission to publish the list of all relevant recommendations in the data collection web site in order to facilitate this reporting activity.

Report from Sub Group 1

Economic Modules

Summary of changes and amendments for the economic modules (including TV's)

United Kingdom

- In Sub module III.A MS states concerning AREA Vb, that due to an international dispute no UK vessels have access to Faroese waters in this area and therefore no species will be sampled.
- Justified and acceptable, no major change.
-
- Concerning long distance fisheries (CECAF, ICCAT, IOTC) MS describes a limited involvement and has updated the description of long distance fisheries 2009, 2010 and 2011.

Justified and acceptable, no major change.

- MS changed the type of data collection scheme from probability sampling to non-probability sampling for those variables where the data source is vessel account or survey. No justification is given.
- Substantial change, no justification is given, could be acceptable if a clear justification and methodological description is provided.
-
- One change in table IV.A.1, now carp in cages is included.
- Minor change, improvement, acceptable.
-
- In table IV.A.2 the frame population for on-growing sea bass and sea bream has been adapted to the total population. A reference year has been adapted.

Minor change, acceptable.

- In table IV.A.3 MS has copied and pasted the description for reference year 2010 to reference 2011 and subsequent years. But still the description of all variables is missing.

Minor change, could be acceptable if a full list of variables would have been provided. This full list is still missing, it is a substantial lack and not acceptable.

- MS has just added the necessary information for reference years 2011 and 2012.

Minor change and fully acceptable.

Spain

- Spain has added information on sub modules III.F.1.3, III.F.1.4, III.F.1.5, III.F.2.3 and III.F.3.3.

Changes are substantial and necessary. They are fully acceptable.

Sweden

- Sweden reminds that “National correspondents of RCM Baltic countries are requested to complete the “common practice for transversal data collection” table with information on the practice of data collection used in the respective country. MS are invited to check the table, and input information consistent with their National Programs”. MS states, that no such table has been circulated and therefore no action has been taken.

Could be substantial and should be clarified by RCM Baltic, STECF and European Commission. Change of NP is fully acceptable.

- For several issues (Aquaculture, Processing and others) responsibility was transferred from Swedish Board of Fisheries to The Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM).

Minor change and fully acceptable.

France

- MS has updated figures in sub module III.A for actual number of vessels.

Fully acceptable.

- France has added new fisheries in table III.A.1.

Fully acceptable.

- Sub module III.F.2.1: Concerning *vessels over 10m, all supra-regions*, France mentions the problems to collect data and to calculate values for some variables and that no reliable results could be provided. With on-going initiatives starting in 2011 France hopes to improve data quality.

Especially because these segments are the most important part of the fleet and because the data collection led to poor results in the past, it is necessary to provide more specific and detailed information about how to overcome these problems. It is acceptable only with additional information.

- Referring to *vessels under 10m, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic*, MS mentions the problems to collect data and to calculate values for some variables and that no reliable results

could be provided. With on-going initiatives starting in 2011 France hopes to improve data quality.

As the data collection led to poor results in the past, it is necessary to provide more specific and detailed information about how to overcome the problems even for the small-scale fishery in this areas. It is acceptable only with additional information.

- Concerning *vessels under 10m, Mediterranean and Black Sea, Other regions*, France states that the possibility of collecting specific variables will be studied in 2012.

This is a substantial change as it was promised already for a former period. It should have been possible to evaluate the possibility based on the promised pilot study and the on-site sampling for former years. The change is acceptable only with a justification of why the evaluation of possibility has not been carried out.

- Sub module III.F.2.2: Data for two groups of variables will not be available for *vessels over 10m, all supra-regions and vessels under 10m, North Sea and Eastern Artic, North Atlantic*.

No justification has been provided; no action to improve is mentioned. This is not acceptable, in particular not for the main fleet segments.

- Concerning *vessels under 10m, Mediterranean and Black Sea, Other regions*, MS gives information that reliable results could not be provided.

Not justified, no action to improve the situation is described. This is not acceptable.

- Table III.F.1 has been changed according to the text.

See above. Not acceptable.

- III.F.2.5. France describes the problems to provide data on a specific group of variables, as already mentioned before.

No additional information on how to overcome the problems is given. It is not acceptable without further clarification.

Lithuania

- Sub module III.B.1. MS mentions the forms used for data collection, indicating in Table 1 included in the text, data sources and the institution responsible for data collection and proceeding.

Minor change and fully acceptable.

- Sub module III.F.1.1 and III.F.1.2 MS had made the spelling corrections on the text. In Table III.F.I. MS is specifying data sources detailing the segments of total population target.

The changes are minor and improving the NP, these are fully acceptable.

- Sub module III.F.2.1, III.F.2.2 and F.III.2.3 MS mentions the use of Council Regulation for Conservation factor, updating the corresponding Table III.F.2.

The changes are minor and improving the NP, these are fully acceptable.

- Sub module III.F.3.1 MS indicates the EU Regulation applied and in Table 2, inserted in the text, is indicating source for data collected.

The changes are minor and improving the NP, these are fully acceptable.

- Sub module III.F.3.2 and III.F.3.3 MS had made the spelling corrections on the text.

The changes are minor and improving the NP, these are fully acceptable.

- Sub module IV.B.1MS indicates data sources and the institution responsible for data collection and proceeding, illustrated in Table 3, inserted in the text. Table IV.A.2 is accordingly up dated.

The changes are minor and improving the NP, these are fully acceptable.

Malta

- Sub module III.B.1. MS mentions the calculation of indicators/data forms used for data collection, indicating the follow up of SGECA recommendations.

Minor change is improving the programme quality. It is fully acceptable.

- Sub module III.B.2. MS mentions the methods applied and the content of data collected, as well their calculation.

Minor change is improving the programme quality. It is fully acceptable.

- Sub module III.B.3. MS mentions that the response rate and the coefficient of variation for every segment to determine the precision level are according to EU Decision and SGECA report provisions.

Minor change is improving the programme quality. It is fully acceptable

- Sub module IV.A.2. MS explains the calculation of data collected.

Minor change is improving the programme quality. It is fully acceptable

- Sub module IV.A.3. MS details the methodology used for the collection of data.

Minor change is improving the programme quality. It is fully acceptable

- Sub module IV.A.4. MS explains the calculation of data collected by applying the provisions and recommendations of EU Decision and SGECA report.

Minor change is improving the programme quality. It is fully acceptable.

- Sub modules IV.B.1, IV.B.2 and IV.B.3 MS explains the calculation of data and the respectively methodologies used by applying the provisions and recommendations of EU Decision and SGECA report.

Minor change is improving the programme quality. It is fully acceptable.

Netherlands

- III.B.1 (B) – ICES Region and NAFO areas only - Change in the ‘name’ of the type of data collection which is a correction and is in line with the guidelines.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

- III.B.1 (E) – ICES Region and NAFO areas only - The change explains the new set up of the panel used in probability sampling. A description of the stratification of the sampling unit and the further stratification of segments (Beam Trawl boats 24-40m) is provided and explained. A description of the new sample size is also provided and the representativeness was tested.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

- III.B.2 – ICES Region and NAFO areas only- The change explains the developments in the case of non-response from paper questionnaires. It explains, as requested by the guidelines how the MS will deal with non-responses.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

- III.B.3 – ICES Region and NAFO areas only - The change describes the justification of the use of a panel selection as it meets the requirements of a probability sample survey. Methods to estimate standard error according to the ESS handbook for quality reports are mentioned in the case of random sampling. No formula is presented.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

- III.B.5 - ICES Region and NAFO areas and other regions - The change regards updated recommendations which were provided by RCM Med&BS and RCM-LDF 2011. This update was required to have a complete list of recommendations.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

- III.F.2.1 - The change refers to an update with regards to the implementation of the e-logbook system. It provides further information about the state of play.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

- III.F. 2.4 - The change regards updated recommendations which were provided by RCM Med&BS and RCM-LDF 2011. This update was required to have a complete list of recommendations.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

- IV.A.1 - The changes regard an update in terms of the number of aquaculture companies and the inclusion of a description of companies which are excluded from the data collection.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

- IV. B.4 - The change is an update with regards to the state of play of a simulation model which will be developed by the Netherlands. It also explains the reason why data for the reference year 2009 has been delayed.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

- IV.B.6 - The change regards a derogation which asks for additional data on a particular variable (fixed costs) to be delivered.

The change is minor and is considered justified and acceptable.

Romania

Romania provided the totally revised chapter on aquaculture data collection – module IV.A.2. This is supplemented with the corresponding tables Table IV.A.3.

The text does not stand as a standalone document for methodological report as requested for the National Programmes. The data collection method description is not detailed enough for evaluation of the methodology used. Neither the estimation procedures for totals nor accuracy indicators are provided.

Germany

- III B 1 (e) – There is a modification regarding the non probability to probability classification of the sampling strategy. Clarification is needed on whether this is just a modification on how the current sampling strategy is classified or whether a change in the current sampling strategy has been adopted.

In case of it being just a new classification of the current sampling strategy the change is justified and acceptable. In case of a change in the data collection method MS should provide the detailed revised methodological report.

- III B 1 (e) - With regards to clustering and specification of active and inactive vessels, Germany makes minor changes in the NP, which are justified to answer to Comments on German Data Collection Programme 2011-13 (ref. MARE C3/VV/VD/HR ARES(2010)512785 of 16 August 2010). They are reflected in the text of section III.B.6 (non conformities) regarding the definition of active vessels.

It is a minor change which is justified and acceptable.

- Table III.B.2 – the changes regards the comment about clustering. These changes were minor because they refer to two coastal vessels (less than 24 m length) that are said to be negligible in comparison with the entire fleet (segment).

It is a minor change which is justified and acceptable.

- III B 3 - There are also changes to the programme with regard to the provision of further information on correction procedures for potential bias. They come as an answer to Comments on German Data Collection Programme 2011-13 (ref. MARE C3/VV/VD/HR ARES(2010)512785 of 16 August 2010).

The changes are minor, justified and acceptable.

- III.B.6 (non conformities) - in the text Germany asks for a derogation in order to exclude dredgers employed only for aquaculture from the fleet data. This modification is justified and acceptable as it avoids double counting of economic variables in the tables related to the fleet and those related to aquaculture, and thus gives a better picture of the sector as a whole.

The change is substantial, justified and acceptable.

- III B 6- There is a demand to accept a methodological change on the clustering of vessels that shift between two fishing techniques during the year in an equal proportion using the average of several previous years.

This is a substantial methodology change, it is justified and acceptable but if changes are undertaken coherence with biological data should be checked.

- III F 2 1 - Germany makes a minor modification in the NP to answer Comments on the German Data Collection Programme 2011-13 (ref. MARE C3/VV/VD/HR ARES(2010)512785 of 16 August 2010) regarding the sampling protocol and methods used for vessels <8m.

This modification is justified and acceptable, as it provides an explanation and a copy of the questionnaire used.

- IV. A 1 - There is a modification to the text in the programme to answer a comment on German Data Collection Programme 2011-13 (ref. MARE C3/VV/VD/HR ARES(2010)512785 of 16 August 2010) asking to supply the missing text on oyster production mentioned in Table IV A 1.

The change is minor, justified and acceptable.

- IV.A.2 - Germany makes a modification to abide with the definition of the variables and to provide a definition of financial cost, as demanded in the comments on German Data Collection Programme 2011-13 (ref. MARE C3/VV/VD/HR ARES(2010)512785 of 16 August 2010)

The change is minor, justified and acceptable.

- IV. A 5 - Germany makes some clarifications and considerations on the reference year as well as to consider any confidentiality problems with the oyster and the mussels industries, which are justified as an answer to Comments on German Data Collection Programme 2011-13 (ref. MARE C3/VV/VD/HR ARES(2010)512785 of 16 August 2010).

The changes are minor, justified and acceptable.

- IV.B 1 e- In the Comments on German Data Collection Programme 2011-13 (ref. MARE C3/VV/VD/HR ARES(2010)512785 of 16 August 2010) Germany is asked to clarify whether data for enterprises below 20 employees will be reported.

The change is minor, it is justified and acceptable

Ireland

- III B 1 A - Ireland completes the text with information already included in the tables regarding the use of questionnaires as data source.

The change is minor, justified and acceptable.

- III.B.1.A – the change regards an economic variable and mentions fuel efficiency, which is in reality an ecosystem variable. This comment is misplaced and should be noted under the ecosystem variables

The change is minor and justified but not acceptable as fuel costs are not demanded on a quarterly basis as part of economic variables. This change should therefore be moved to section V.

- III.B.1.B - a modification is introduced as the previewed introduction of a statutory instrument to implement the census (also mentioned in III.B.1.E) has already been performed.

The change is substantial, justified and acceptable.

- III.B.1.D - a modification is introduced in the methodology, as sales notes data are not mentioned anymore and this modification has not been reflected in the table. No justification for this decision has been found in the text and it is therefore not acceptable, and should be clarified.

The change is minor, but not justified and not acceptable.

- IV A 1– a modification has been introduced to update the general description of the aquaculture sector to refer to more recent information (2009 as compared to 2006).

The change is minor, justified and acceptable.

- IV A 2 A- There are modifications to further detail some categories of cost (such as egg and fish).

Both changes are minor, justified and acceptable.

- IV A 2 A – There is a modification in the definition of capital value and net investment. This is an improvement as it corrects a previous mistake of double counting depreciation.

The change is minor, justified and acceptable.

- IV A 2 B- There is a modification to include an improvement (the establishment of a new data collection instrument) which is not correctly reflected in the table, as table IV.A.3 still includes census and probability sampling when the MS has stated in the text that non probability sampling will also be used.

The change is substantial. It is justified by the expected inclusion of the instrument and acceptable when tables will also be updated.

(There is a related minor, justified and acceptable improvement as the questionnaire is now included in the annex).

- IV A 2 C. - There are improvements in the detail of the estimation procedure, including cross-checking procedures.

The changes are minor, justified and acceptable.

- IV B 1 A- There is an improvement in the amount of data as now full financial accounts are used instead of the abridged ones.

This is a substantial change, which is justified and acceptable; the tables should be updated accordingly.

- IV.B.1.B - a modification is introduced as the previewed introduction of a statutory instrument to implement the census to collect processing sector variables has already been performed.

This is a substantial change which is justified and acceptable.

Denmark

- III B - a modification in section III.B.3 was made to update the applicable regulation.

The change is minor, justified and acceptable.

- III.B.5 - a minor modification was made to explain that economists did not attend RCM meetings as expected in the original NP.

The change is minor, justified and acceptable, as the planned coordination meeting for economists has not taken place yet.

- III.F - Some modifications are made to address comments by RCM and STECF.

The changes are minor, justified and acceptable, as Denmark has already answered such questions or has taken action to do so.

Note on some Substantial Changes

Germany

III B

There a substantial change as the non probability sampling has been substituted by probability sampling for some segments. This is an improvement in the methodology which is justified to avoid non probability sampling and is acceptable as it improves the quality of the data.

IV.B

In the Comments on German Data Collection Programme 2011-13 (ref. MARE C3/VV/VD/HR ARES(2010)512785 of 16 August 2010) Germany is asked to clarify whether data for enterprises below 20 employees will be reported. Is this substantial because a clustering has been changed, but it is justified and acceptable? (decreasing the size of survey)

Ireland

In section III.B.1.b a substantial modification is introduced as the previewed introduction of a statutory instrument to implement the census (also mentioned in III.B.1.e) has already been performed. This is justified and acceptable. (increasing the size of survey)

In section IV.B.1.b a substantial modification is introduced as the previewed introduction of a statutory instrument to implement the census to collect processing sector variables has already been performed. This is justified and acceptable. (increasing the size of survey)

General Comments

Generally the revised NPs present few and minor changes. Only in few cases was possible to evaluate the financial implications of these modifications.

The Group considers that, at least for Annual Report 2013, all the adjustments carried out by MSs must be clearly reported in the Annual Report to illustrate the activities implemented in the reference year. This rule has to be applied to all kind of adjustments (minor, major, substantial etc etc) even in case MS have submitted or not a revised version of the National Program. All these “adjustments” should then appear in the relevant tables of the Annual Report Changes in AR tables with respect to the NP tables should be tracked in red.

According to Commission Decision 93/2010, all MS performing the ranking system should use the average values of the 2 previous years. It is recommended that MS (even they submitted or not a revised version of the National Program) use the most update set of values (i.e. landing values, tons, fishing days) in order to select the métiers to be sampled.

A revision of the NP should include recommendations from RCMs. However, the group considers that in some cases these recommendations refer to minor adjustments in the sampling scheme with no impact on the budget forecast. In all these cases, the MS should be aware that they can adjust the NP by simply reporting the adjustments in the Annual Report.

In addition, the Commission should clarify if major changes in the NP - such as methodological revisions and changes in the design of a survey – can be undertaken and, if yes, the Commission should provide to MS clear procedures. The Commission should also specify what are considered minor, major, or substantial changes (methodological issues, sampling design, changing in the surveys, derogations etc etc).

All the most update recommendations (from SGRN, SGECA, STECF, RCM, Liaison meeting) have to be listed in the Annual report and the actions taken by the MS should be reported. The group recommends the Commission to publish the list of all relevant recommendations in the data collection web site in order to facilitate this reporting activity.

Report from Sub Group 2

Denmark, Ireland, Malta, Portugal, UK

UK

- Describe each Revision (1 to X)
 - Major reduction in the Scottish sea-sampling programme as well as reduced number of trips in the market sampling is proposed. Pelagic fisheries will no longer be sampled at sea since there is a high-grading ban (see general comment). EWG realizes that this probably will have an impact the overall data quality but acknowledges the effort made by MS to minimise the impact on the achieved precision. EWG will be vigilant on end-user feedback on this issue.
 - MS proposes an updated list of derogations, but does not always make reference to RCM view (see general comment). EWG acknowledges that low coverage on-board sampling in pelagic fisheries may not be appropriate to capture the discard patterns. Reasons for applying for derogation presented by MS are reasonable and acceptable and this needs to be brought for discussion to the next RCM.
 - MS proposed a change in sampling design for recreational fisheries for 2012 following the approach proposed in ICES PGRFS. EWG acknowledges that this is an improvement of the NP.
 - MS proposes major changes in the section covering surveys. These changes include;
 - DYFS coast of NS Q3&4 is removed from bid;
 - Western IBTS Q4 is removed from bid and the intention is to replaced it by a new survey Q1 from 2013
 - Survey design already changed for Scottish IBTS Q1 and IBTS Q4;

The EWG seriously question these unilateral changes in the surveys proposed by the MS. Last year a major revision was done regarding the surveys on the DCF list (SGRN 10-03). In accordance with the evaluation criteria DCF surveys need to be internationally coordinated and harmonized. This implies that internationally agreed manuals need to be followed and that major changes in the designs and/or manual need to be agreed in advance by the coordinating group. If MS fail to do so it could be questioned if the survey should be considered international and thereby eligible under the DCF. Further, in accordance with the evaluation criteria DCF surveys need to be designed to inform management decisions (including stock assessment). If an internationally coordinated survey fail to do so this need to be put forward by the end-user (e.g ICES) and not as unilateral positions by an individual MS. The WGBEAM that coordinate the YFS have further expressed it is disappointment with the UK approach;

"Due to financial constraints, from 2011 the UK inshore surveys in the Humber/Wash and Thames (YFS) will no longer be carried out. WGBEAM is disappointed that this decision has been made. Although the UK YFS surveys aren't used an individual tuning series, WGNSSK does use a combined index consisting of Dutch, German and Belgian-DYFS and YFS. In the past they have been used for the short term forecast and therefore could have quite an affect on the TAC advice, although in recent years the assessment working group has used the long-term mean. In future the combined index for inshore surveys will no longer consist of the UK YFS and will need to be recalculated." (report WGBEAM, 2011)

- Unilateral actions may further undermine the international cooperation within DCF. MS is further reminded that the DCF survey list is not open for new surveys. Possible implications of the proposed changes in surveys put forward by the UK need to be discussed by STECF before they can be approved.
- State if Revision Minor or Substantial (will it change NP and have financial implications)

Substantial

- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Justified and improves the NP
Revisions in fisheries programme origins from budget reductions and shortage in staff. It is out of the remit of the EWG to have an opinion if this is considered a justification or not. However the MS have taken steps to minimize the reduction of quality in data. These steps are justified and seem to limit the consequences of the reduction in sampling.
Revisions in sampling of recreational fisheries are justified and improve the NP
Revisions related to the surveys are justified by the MS in the NP but they are not in line with requirement for the DCF surveys.

Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Acceptable

Revisions in survey chapter need to be discussed in the proper international coordinating groups before it can be assessed if they are acceptable or not.

Denmark

Describe each Revision

- Metier section : minor revision, mainly improving the description and methodology to collect data. New derogations from sampling some metier by on-board observers.
- Stock section : updated with the most recent RCM recommendations, even with recommendations not directly addressed to MS, which should be avoided.
- Tables : new figures were not highlighted so EWG could not comment
- State if Revision Minor or Substantial (will it change NP and have financial implications)
Revisions are minor
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Justified and improves the NP
Revision is justified and improved the NP, although technical descriptions should preferably be put in annex.
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Acceptable
Revision is acceptable

Ireland

- Describe each Revision
Mainly updates of the description of the methods and fisheries data and small corrections of errors. The only real change, which is considered minor, is in the metier section where they have added sampling of the metier targeting boarfish.
- State if Revision Minor or Substantial (will it change NP and have financial implications)
Revisions are minor
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Justified and improves the NP
revision improves the NP
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Acceptable

Revision is acceptable.

Malta

- Describe each Revision
 - The version proposed to EWG did not have track changes. The expert from Malta kindly highlighted the changes, but what was deleted from the original NP proposal was still missing.
 - Metier section : a new ranking process modified the métiers to sample. Several new métiers is included in the sampling programme while purse seining for large pelagics is removed. There are some inconsistencies (relation between value, volume and effort) in the ranking (table III.C.1) that requires cross-checking and clarification.
- State if Revision Minor or Substantial (will it change NP and have financial implications)
Judgement on the characteristics of the revision is dependent on if the new ranking is correct or not. As presented in the proposed update of the NP it is considered substantial.
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Justified and improves the NP
Justified but table III_C_1 needs to be checked. Improvement
The follow-up of RCM and MEDITS recommendations is an improvement to the NP.
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Acceptable
Acceptable

Portugal

- Describe each Revision
MS has proposed a one page addendum to the NP 2011-2013 with modifications linked to RCM recommendations. MS proposed also a new set of tables but without coloring changes, so it is difficult for EWG to comment on the tables.
Metier section : addition of a pilot study on trammel net fishery between 200 and 600m isobaths.
- State if Revision Minor or Substantial (will it change NP and have financial implications)
Addition of a pilot study is substantial
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Justified and improves the NP
Revision is justified and improved the NP
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Acceptable
Revision is acceptable

General comments

On the revision of the National Programmes within a programme period

Revisions in the text of the NP proposals within the programme period should be done in a way allowing the reader to follow the development in the MS. This means that all information valid for the first years of the triannual programme should be kept and not deleted. For example, if a pilot study was carried out in 2011 and the NP for 2012 was revised in accordance with the result from the pilot study, information about the pilot study should be kept in the text of the NP, specifying that this was the situation in 2011, and description of the related modifications should be added, specifying that this was the revised situation for 2012..

The handling of RCM recommendations in NP proposals differ between MS which has an effect on the consistency of all NPs and may impact the review process in the EWG. In accordance with the present guidelines recommendations from the RCMs and follow up by MS should be presented in the different sections on regional coordination of the NP and not as one combined list in the report. However different MS are dealing with this differently and it may be more clear if all RCM recommendations and actions following them could be presented in one list. This issue needs to be discussed when the guidelines are updated.

RCM recommendations that the MS already have acted upon should not be deleted when MS revise their NP *within* the programme period.

When MS apply for derogation to sample certain metiers, it is of importance that the derogation is also put in a regional context. What is the importance of the metier in the regional view? Has RCM concluded that sampling is well covered by other countries? This kind of information is usually compiled in the RCM reports, and should be included in the NP proposal allowing the EWG to judge the potential consequences of a derogation. EWG 11-19 recommends that the guidelines need to be updated.

On the issue of sea-sampling within a regime of high-grading or discard ban

Bans on high-grading for certain species and areas have in recent years been included in the EU legislation. Such bans will affect the discard patterns in certain fisheries and is likely increase/introduce an observer effect. In the proposals for revisions in the NP there are examples of a MS abandon sea-sampling in a certain fishery as a consequence of a high-grading ban. In the present proposal from the Commission on a new Common Fisheries Policy discard bans is one of the new important elements. Such bans will of course affect the kind of data that sea-sampling programmes can provide. It is important that the role of the sea-sampling programmes within a possible future regime of discard ban is thoroughly discussed within the revision process of the DCF.

EWG 11-19 recommends that the role of sea sampling programmes in a management regime of discard ban needs to be discussed in the revision of the DCF.

On the issue of analysis to merge metiers

Some MS have put considerable effort into describe and analyse their metiers in order to merge them for sampling purposes. The Lot2 “Comparative investigation of statistical methods for identifying and prediction métiers from logbooks data. A workflow applied to the international otter trawl fisheries in the North Sea” project have also been finalised. It is of importance that knowledge gained in the “lot” projects intended to increase quality in data collection is transferred to non partner MS as well. It is too early to state that the methods for identifying metiers in logbook data developed by the Lot 2 project is suitable to all countries and fisheries but MS need to gain experience in order to assess the usefulness.

It is however highly advisable that MS start to work with the tools developed within Lot 2 to gain experience. The outcomes of the analysis should then be contrasted with the results from the routine analysis. Experience could then be brought to the training course planned by ICES (25th-29th of June 2012).

Recommendation: MS to start work with tools developed within Lot 2 and contrast the outcome with other methods used.

Report from Sub group 3 **Spain, Lithuania, Poland, Romania**

Romania.

Table II.B.1 should be completed and resubmitted using the approved list of eligible meetings, as the planned attendance at international meetings is unclear.

Romania provided only text highlighting the main revisions to the NP. While this document was useful, the MS is reminded that there is a need to resubmit the entire NP text and Tables with all changes highlighted in track changes.

Poland.

Table II.B.1 should be resubmitted, using the approved list of eligible meetings.

Module III.C Poland asks for **derogation** for sampling the metier targeting Greenland halibut in ICES area XIV. The derogation extends to biological sampling of this species also. The derogation appears justified and acceptable, and is also supported by the RCM NS & EA 2011.

Module III.C Poland also asks for **derogation** for sampling of metier OTB_DEF_>120_0_0 targeting saithe in ICES area IV. Poland has no TAC for saithe. Catches depend entirely on quota exchange; landings were less than 10% of Community share for the reference period 2007-2008. One trip per year by one commercial vessel only is conducted. Sufficient quota availability in 2012-2013 is highly uncertain, and landings take place in Norway/Iceland. The Discard rate is less than 10%. The derogation also extends to biological sampling of this species also. The derogation appears to be justified and acceptable.

Substantial : III.C.5: Following RCM LDF 2011 recommendation, Poland signed a ***Multi-lateral agreement between Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, The Netherlands and Poland for biological data collection of pelagic fisheries in CECAF waters***. Biological sampling will be carried out according to sampling protocol discussed and agreed at RCM LDF 2011 and described in “*Biological Data Collection of pelagic fisheries in CECAF waters in compliance with the DCF*”. Additional sampling strategy information is also provided for the SPRFMO area. These revisions are justified and acceptable, and improve data collection in this region.

Lithuania

III.C.4 The sampling season was extended by 1 month from April to November, for the Eel fishery in the Baltic in the table however the text still refers to the 2011 seasonality of April to October. **MS to clarify.**

OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 (targeting *Pandalus borealis*) the MS says that there is only one vessel, completing one trip per year, when apparently 2 trips were completed. **MS to clarify**

III.C and III.E **North Sea and Eastern Arctic**: Lithuania intended to sample **other biological parameters** for *Pandalus borealis*, and *Sebastes marinus*. However the MS says that they are unable to sample “other Biological Parameters” as they do not have the expertise to complete the biological sampling.

The reasons given by the MS are:

1. Crew members of the vessels and observers are not trained to collect otoliths and define sex and maturity;
2. Lithuania has never had biologists for species outside the Baltic Sea. As we don't have age readers for other species, collection of otoliths is time consuming and wasteful;
3. Seeking for cooperation with other countries on task sharing failed due to inactivity of some countries involved into same task.

The above reasons are not acceptable. MS should justify and seek a formal derogation, or seek cooperation with other MS.

OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 , and OTM_DEF_100-119_0_0 in the **North Sea and Eastern Arctic**, all sampling on these fleets is carried out by the crew of the vessels involved, i.e. self sampling. This is not ideal, as concurrent at sea sampling should be quality controlled by observer trips. **If only one trip is conducted each year then the MS should make every effort to send an observer on board, trained to remove otoliths, and define sex and maturity parameters.**

III.C and III.E North Atlantic: The MS says that they are unable to sample “other Biological Parameters” for *Sebastes marinus*, and other species in this area as they do not have the expertise to complete the biological sampling.

The reasons given by the MS are:

1. Crew members of the vessels and observers are not trained to collect otoliths and define sex and maturity;
2. Lithuania has never had biologists for species outside the Baltic Sea. As we don't have age readers for other species, collection of otoliths is time consuming and wasteful;
3. Seeking for cooperation with other countries on task sharing failed due to inactivity of some countries involved into same task.

The above reasons are not acceptable. MS should justify and seek a formal derogation, or seek cooperation with other MS.

In the **SPRFMO region**, Lithuania says they will not sample “Other Biological Parameters” as all data collection at sea is under **Self Sampling**, and there is a lack of experience for this data collection. This is not an acceptable reason. **MS should justify and seek a formal derogation, or seek cooperation with other MS.** The accompanying Table III.E.1 is lacking information on the share of TAC and EU landings for the Pacific – **MS to complete the table and resubmit.**

Substantial: III.C.5: Following RCM LDF 2011 recommendation, Lithuania signed a *Multi-lateral agreement between Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, The Netherlands and Poland for biological data collection of pelagic fisheries in CECAF waters*. Biological sampling will be carried out according to sampling protocol discussed and agreed at RCM LDF 2011 and described in “*Biological Data Collection of pelagic fisheries in CECAF waters in compliance with the DCF*”. These revisions are justified and acceptable, and improve data collection in this region.

Spain.

Tables III.C. and III.E are impossible to read as they contain too many colors, filters, comments within cells and additional comments etc... to allow any meaningful evaluation of the revisions to the tables.

Also in **Table III.C.1** the reference years are mixed: '07 – '08, '09 and '08 – '09. The MS is requested to resubmit **clean versions of theses tables with only the revisions highlighted**.

Under the heading Regional Coordination: Spain appears to have deleted its reference to a **bi – lateral** agreement with the **UK**, without any explanation. **MS to clarify**.

Substantial: Follow up of RCM NS&EA recommendations: The MS says that it will wait to see the report and conclusions of the meeting on regional databases. However given that Spain did not comply with the landings data call upload into FISHFRAME in 2011, which is a formal data end user data call through the RCM this is not acceptable.

III.C.1 the change in the **naming convention of métiers in “Other Regions”**. The Naming and codifying of metiers were updated following the recommendations of the RCM LDF, which requested MS to add the 3 letters of the alpha code of the species which is the same as the fishing ground is (level 7). This revision is justified and acceptable.

Substantial: III.C. 1: ICCAT Area. Spain highlights its inability to put observers at sea on fleets operating in this area due to the threat of piracy. Instead Spain proposes a **Pilot study** to implement a system of electronic monitoring on board the purse seine tuna fleet operating in the Indian and Atlantic oceans.

This revision is deemed justified; a **project proposal is provided as an annex to the NP**, and appears acceptable, however further information **detailing the methodology e.g planned sampling targets etc... of the Pilot Study is requested**.

Substantial: III.G. Details of the **REDNOR** survey which was scheduled to take place in 2009/2010 are deleted from the 2012 NP. However the text implies that this survey should take place every 2yrs, therefore a REDNOR survey is expected in the 2012 NP. **MS to clarify**.

General comments

Revision of the Guidelines.

The guidelines for the provision of the revised National Programmes state that revisions made to the original text of the National Programme should be highlighted in red to facilitate review of the changes. The guidelines should be updated to reflect the request to highlight revisions to NP text as track changes. Revisions to Tables should be highlighted in red, and the previous text and tables should be made available to the review group, by the Commission for ease of comparison.

The final version of the approved NP is what should appear on the DCF website – this needs to be updated.

It is recommended that the updated guidelines should request all MS to include a summary page giving a brief overview of the main revision made to the NP.

The National Programmes are submitted as a multiannual programme. The current programme 2011-2013 is based on the reference period 2007-2008, as recommended by the Liaison Meeting. Changing the reference period may have a huge impact on the selection of metiers and may have an impact on regional aspects with regard to sampling coverage.

There is also the opinion that NP should be based on the most up to date reference years, which implies in most cases, that MS NP submissions will need to be revised annually.

In general, as soon as a change has to be made to the multi-annual programme by a MS, the MS should submit a revised version for evaluation. MS are not in the position to independently judge whether a revision is a minor or substantial change to the Programme.

In order to ensure consistency clear guidelines from the EU Commission are required.

General Issues for the MS.

Member states are reminded to adhere to the updated guidelines. In some cases, review by the subgroup was not possible as changes were not highlighted.

Moreover, changes to tables are difficult to review when MS use national colour-coding within their tables. MS are reminded to tidy up tables and only highlight or colour cells that were revised. Also, MS should refrain from adding national comments alongside the standard tables.

As described in the guidelines, MS are reminded to use scientific species names throughout the Programme.

General Comments to improve the process.

Some MS did not include the list of eligible meetings as this list was not circulated in time before the submission. Some MS did not include the list of STECF or LM recommendations as these lists were not circulated in time before submission. Given that these lists were not equally available to all MS at the same time, these parts of the revised NP's can't be evaluated properly.

The timing of the LM needs reconsideration as the LM recommendations are not channelled to the MS in due time. Moreover, as LM is scheduled right after the RCM's, LM lacks complete RCM reports to review and LM is unable to judge final recommendations by the RCMs. LM should provide a final list of recommendations for inclusion in the NPs, rather than MS taking over the unofficial lists of recommendations by the RCMs.

Report from Sub Group 4

Germany, France, Netherlands, Sweden, Slovenia

General considerations

Generally the revised NPs present only few and minor changes. Only in few cases it was possible to evaluate the financial implications of these modifications.

The Group considers, that, at least for Annual Report 2012 (May 2013), all the adjustments carried out by MSs must be clearly reported in the Annual Report to illustrate the activities implemented in the reference year. This rule has to be applied to all kind of adjustments (minor, major, substantial etc etc) even in cases where MS have submitted or not a revised version of the National Program. All these “adjustments” should then appear in the relevant tables of the Annual Report. Changes in AR tables with respect to the NP tables should be tracked in red.

Recommendations for the Future

19. An “Annual Working Plan” from all MS with the most update data set
20. A revised version of the NP (independently from the changes occurred) each MS will specify/highlight in a separate box the changes made to the NP. The Commission will decide if these changes are minor, major substantial and the NP will follow a different “road” on the basis of the modification occurred.
21. If the changes are minor (to be defined by who? Commission...) all these will appear only in the AR, and MS are not obliged to re-submit the NP. MS that will have substantial changes should resubmit the NP

Not only for the period 2014-2020 but we should think also for the AR 2012 (submission in May 2013) and AR 2013 (submission May 2014)

According to Commission Decision 93/2010, all MS performing the ranking system should use the average values of the 2 previous years. It is recommended that MS (even they submitted or not a revised version of the National Program) use the most update set of values (i.e. landing values, tons, fishing days) in order to select the métiers to be sampled.

A revision of the NP should include recommendations from RCMs. However, the group considers that in some cases these recommendations refer to minor adjustments in the sampling scheme with no impact on the budget forecast. In all these cases, the MS should be aware that they can adjust the NP by simply reporting the adjustments in the Annual Report.

In addition, the Commission should clarify if major changes in the NP - such as methodological revisions and changes in the design of a survey – can be undertaken and, if yes, the Commission should provide to MS clear procedures. The Commission should also specify what are considered minor, major, or substantial changes (methodological issues, sampling design, changing in the surveys, derogations etc etc).

All the most update recommendations (from SGRN, SGECA, STECF, RCM, Liaison meeting) have to be listed in the Annual report and the actions taken by the MS should be reported. The group recommends the Commission to publish the list of all relevant recommendations in the data collection web site in order to facilitate this reporting activity.

Germany

Generally, the revised version of the NP refers to minor adjustments in the sampling scheme. Minor changes are not dealt with in this section. Some major adjustments referred to the following modules:

Module III.C.1 and III.C.6 “Region Baltic Sea” - MS should better specify the concept of species presents “*inside the baseline of German coastal waters and outside the baseline*”. No where in the Commission Decision 93/2010 distinction between water inside or outside of the baseline is mentioned. Catch of pike-perch and/or perch must be considered as a unique catch without any “baseline limit”. EWG 11-19 considers this distinction not acceptable and the requested derogation not approved.

Module III.C.5 and III.C.6 “Other regions” - On this issue MS reached an agreement with Netherlands during the RCMLDF 2011. EWG 11-19 considers the justification of the modification proposed by the country acceptable and that a derogation could be approved.

Module III.E.5 “Region Baltic Sea” – stock related variables. MS should specify more clearly the concept of species present “*inside the baseline of German coastal waters and outside the baseline*”. Catch of freshwater species must be considered as a unique catch without any “baseline limit”. If the total landing of all freshwater species add up to more than the reference limits of 200 tons hence, Germany could avoid to sample (for stock related variables) that species. EWG 11-19 considers this distinction not acceptable and the requested derogation not approved.

Module III.E.5 and III.E.6 “Other regions” - On this issue MS reached an agreement with Netherlands during the RCMLDF 2011. EWG 11-19 considered the issue justified and that modification proposed by the country could be accepted and derogation may be given.

Module 7 - MS should update the table with the most recent follow up of the STECF recommendations.

Module 8 – MS should update the table with the last derogation accepted and the new ones proposed.

General comments

Overall, in the text are missing all the 2010 (and 2011) comments and recommendations made by the RCM 2011. All these comments should be reported under the different sections of each module.

MS should delete from the text all the comments made by the Commission and STECF during the evaluation of the NP and AR. The MS answers should also be deleted but the issues should be incorporated in the text of the NP.

MS is requested to check and use for the different metier the naming convention agreed at Regional Level and to fulfil the tables strictly following the guidelines.

NETHERLAND

Generally, the revised version of the NP includes only minor adjustments in the sampling scheme. Some major adjustments referred to the following module:

Module “III.E.1, III.E.2, III.E.3, III.E.4 “Other Regions” - Following the outputs of the RCMLDF 2011 MS illustrated substantial changes. All these changes have been discussed and agreed during the RCMLDF. MS is requested to apply the ranking system with the most update set of data (in the text is reported that they used 2007-2008 data). The modifications are clearly justified and EWG 11-19 consider the revision acceptable.

Module “III.E.5 “Other Regions” – MS clearly stated that is not in agreement with the outputs of the RCMLDF regarding the use of the ICES Maturity scales. In the absence of a maturity scales for CECAF area, MS is requested to follow the RCM recommendations. EWG 11-19 considers the justification given by MS not acceptable.

General Comments: MS is requested to check and use for the different metier the naming convention agreed at Regional Level and to fulfil the tables strictly following the guidelines.

FRANCE

The revised version of the NP refers to minor adjustments in the sampling scheme. Some major adjustments referred to the following modules:

Module III.C.1 “Other regions” - MS has identified and set in place experiences of auto sampling and are exploring electronic monitoring as recommended by RCM LDF (March 2010). These actions did not provide satisfying results in 2011 as they were not supported by fishermen. MS has stated that they will not be carried out in 2012. EWG 11-19 considers the revision acceptable.

Module III.E.1 “Other Regions – Indian Ocean” - MS propose, for 2012, a study on the fecundity of some large pelagic species following the results of a feasibility study carried out in 2011. EWG 11-19 did not have the possibility to analyse the results of the study and is not in the position to evaluate the financial implication of this issue. MS is requested to provide information on the outcome of the study before acceptance can be given. Furthermore, it should be underlined that sampling of fecundity for large pelagic is not mandatory (not requested by the Commission Reg. 93/2010) and therefore the Commission should analyse the financial implication of this study. For the time being, EWG 11-19 considers the proposed action not acceptable.

Module III.E.5 “Other Regions - Indian Ocean” - MS propose a “study” to aggregate data on landings and discards from 2 metiers (purse-seiners and longliners), gathering billfishes (marlin, sailfish and swordfish). MS is requested to clarify the scope and the relevance of this “study”. Moreover, MS should justify the added value of this study. It is unclear what the meaning of the last sentence is “Only travel costs are associated to this study.” For the time being, EWG 11-19 considers the proposed action not acceptable, data both from landing and from on board sampling should be aggregated and analysed without the request of an extra study.

Module III.E.1 “Other Regions - East Central Atlantic (ICCAT)” - MS propose a study on fecundity of LP following the “good” results of 2011 (this results must be analysed). MS is requested to provide the outcome of the 2011 study. Fecundity sampling for LP is not mandatory (not requested by the Commission Reg. 93/2010) and the Commission may analyse the financial implication of this study. For the time being, EWG 11-19 considers the proposed action not acceptable.

Module VI - In preparation of a regional database for tropical fisheries (Indian Ocean + Central East Atlantic) MS have scheduled some developments in the existing database. EWG 11-19 consider this revision acceptable.

General comments:

All the revised tables should be submitted in excel file and not in PDF.

MS is requested to check and use for the different metier the naming convention agreed at Regional Level and to fulfil the tables strictly following the guidelines.

SWEDEN

Module A – MS have informed about the change of the national organization of the various institutes. EWG 11-19 consider the description of the new organization adequate and acceptable.

Module C.1 “Region Baltic sea” - Generally minor changes have been made in the selection of the metier and EWG 11-19 considers the revision acceptable.

Module III.C.6 “Region Baltic Sea” - The requested derogations are reasonable and the proposal may be accepted.

Module C.1 “Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic”- MS explain that a metier has changed due to change in fishing ground. The explanation seems reasonable and the revision may be accepted.

Module III.C.6 “Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic” - The requested derogations are reasonable and the proposal may be accepted.

Module III.E.1 “Region Baltic Sea” - Generally minor changes have been made in the sampling for biological variables and the EWG 11-19 considers the revision acceptable.

Module III.E.1 “Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic” - Generally minor changes occur in sampling for biological variables and EWG 11-19 considers the revision acceptable.

Module III.E.5 “Region North sea and eastern arctic”- According to the Commission Reg. 93/2010, point B.3.1.a *“The Member State on whose territory the first sale take place, shall be responsible for ensuring that biological sampling occurs according to the standards defined in this Community Programme. If necessary, Member States shall co-operate with the authorities of non-EU third countries to set up biological sampling programmes for the landings carried out by vessels flying the third country’s flag”*
So, the requested derogation (for sampling of mackerel *Scomber scombrus*) in area IVa is acceptable. EWG 11-19 suggests that an agreement at Regional Level should be made.

Module G1 “Surveys” – The explanations given on the problem in change of research vessel to carry out the surveys (Baltic International Trawl Survey (BITS) and IBTS (international Bottom Trawl Survey) are acceptable, however EWG 11-19 consider that the end user of the data should be aware of this change and it is recommended that WGBIFS and WGBFAS evaluate eventual bias.

Module G1 “Surveys” Baltic International Acoustic Survey (BIAS)” – The group understand the technical problem that has occurred to the “R/V ARGOS” and all the financial implications that is related to this situation. The EWG 11-19 recognize that it is a substantial change to the survey but the EWG 11-19 is not in the position to evaluate such modification. EWG 11-19 suggest that WGBIFS tries to clarify this issue, the relevance of the area 30 for the survey and the impact on the assessment of herring and sprat if the survey in sub-division 30 is omitted. Scientific justification of completely deleting the survey in sub-division 30 instead of redesigning the survey eg. larger distances between the transects should be made

Module “III.G.2”. Modifications in the surveys: all the modifications should be listed. MS should revised completely this section

General comments: MS is requested in the relevant section only to list the recommendations of the previous two years RCM’s (at least the recommendations coming from RCM under the DCF)
MS is requested to check and use for the different metier the naming convention agreed at Regional Level and to fulfil the tables strictly following the guidelines.

Slovenia

No changes were detected except updating of table II.B.1

General comments: MS is requested to check and use for the different metier the naming convention agreed at Regional Level and to fulfil the tables strictly following the guidelines.

6 SECTION 3 - ADDRESSING TOR 2

Update SWOT for the DCF

TOR 2. SWOT Analysis of DCF

To evaluate the performance of the DCF since 2008 in order to develop input for the preparation of the post 2013 data collection legal framework. This exercise shall build on the analysis conducted by EWG 11-02 and produce an updated overview of the strength and weaknesses of the current system and develop ideas for possible changes in the post 2013 DCF. This exercise will also draw on relevant comments made by STECF during their 2011 plenary meetings.

The meeting reviewed the SWOT analysis carried out by EWG Group 11-02 in April 2011. The approach taken was to undertake a brainstorm session on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities of the DCF. The objective of this approach was to collate ideas that inform the debate and guide possible changes to the post 2013 DCF.

In a very productive discussion session (over two hours), the invited experts and the Commission engaged and expressed their views on the current DCF and its future needs, in a changing policy landscape. The discussions were kept at a high level to avoid the meeting getting bogged down in technical detail.

This section summarises the key points and issues that emerged during the brainstorm session. The material was then used to update the SWOT carried out in April 2011 (Table 3.1 and Table 3.2).

Key Points Expressed at Brainstorm Session

The following represent the points expressed by individuals at a frank and open exchange of views at the DCF brainstorm session. They are listed in the sequence in which the discussions took place. There is some duplication of points which may capture the importance of the issue. Chatham House Rules were applied in that these notes give no indication of who said what.

It should be emphasised here that the points expressed at the brainstorming session do not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission nor the EWG.

- (1). In the new DCF we are planning for the future. What can we do to ensure MS work together to deliver high quality data and advice to support the CFP?. We need to reflect and generate ideas that build on what we have achieved in the DCF to date, identify new areas that will improve the new DCF. Key issues are; we need to be more organised; more productive; activate more bilateral agreements; task share; improve the dialogue with the Commission and the flow of information between all involved in the DCF; ensure quality control; ensure redundant data are not collected; look into synergies with the Control Regulation.
- (2). Easy access to data by the scientific community is a big issue, particularly in the case of VMS data. Quality of data needs to be improved.
- (3). Outputs from important meetings such as PGCCDBS, WKPRECISE (and others) are not being fully used in DCF. Need to ensure relevant outputs from meetings are communicated and used.
- (4). New policy areas in Fisheries, Aquaculture and Processing need new data sets to inform policy development. What are these data sets? Who should define them?
- (5). We should include fisheries, aquaculture and processing of landlocked states as these are important industries not included in current DCF.

- (6). Progress on the Regional Data Base issue has been good but needs to include freshwater fisheries. Need to consider Black sea. Potential for development of RDB using EMFF funds.
- (7). The current DCF gives an overview of some of the fishing sector, but not all.
- (8). Should we confine DCF to stock assessment of marine waters and collect less?
Do we need complex annual assessments to give scientific advice? Should we have a simpler assessment and advisory process? What are we going to do about data poor stocks – these result from data not collected; data collected is poor quality; data collected is not made available to RFMO. These are important issues.
- (9). What is the purpose of the DCF? What and who does it serve? What should the broad principles of the DCF be? We need to clarify these questions before we develop new DCF. What do we really want out of the DCF? New funds available under EMFF?
Get the underlying principles established before we go into the detail.
- (10). Co-operation through RCM has been a strength of the DCF.
- (11). Need closer co-operation with Norway in relation to DCF. Harmonise methods. Include feedback from other MS not part of EU (e.g, Iceland etc). These make critical input of data to RFMO. ICES include Russia in Baltic – this works well. Need to co-operate with southern Mediterranean countries. We could start with surveys.
- (12). GFCM organise DCF in Mediterranean. Need to improve dialogue and consistency of approach between rest of Europe and all seas areas of DCF.
- (13). In early 2012, first Black Sea Area assessment Working Group will take place. Need to ensure new areas in DCF are better catered for in new DCF.
- (14). As it is, the DCF is unbalanced. In some areas there is a very detailed description as to what is required. In other areas it is left open. Concurrent sampling is very detailed. We need to regulate for “how to do it rather than what data should be collected”. We need to compromise and make the new DCF less complex and focus on making it simpler. The DCF has got bogged down in technical detail on many occasions and we need to ensure this does not happen in new DCF.
- (15). The thinking is that we will have a new DCF programme for a period which sets high principles, that will better define the objectives and outputs. This should provide more flexibility over a multi period. The detail should be delivered in Annual Plans.
- (16). We need to focus on strong regional co-ordination and task sharing in a new DCF.
- (17). The JRC website is a weak link in the DCF and it must be addressed. It is critical that we revamp the JRC website and make it a central part of the DCF. It should be a focal point for the DCF. It should be a library of all DCF material and be central in the coordination of the DCF.
- (18). Most metier data is not used by the RFMO up to now. Why are we collecting it? What was there such an emphasis on collecting it in the current DCF. This is maybe a symptom of data collectors rather than data end users defining what is required. We should not repeat this in the new DCF.
- (19). There are many important Workshops at ICES that have great relevance for the DCF. However, the outputs are not followed up and many MS are unaware of the outputs. A system needs to be put in place that ensures outputs are fed into DCF process. Follow up outputs – ensure relevant results are communicated and applied in DCF.
- (20). Need for more co-ordination; not just the RCM and LM. Need more co-ordination between MS and EU. The National Correspondents need greater voice in process and more regular non technical meetings. A high level forum that reviews the principles and objectives of the DCF and that regularly reviews the DCF in terms of “is it fit for purpose”.
- (21). The MSFD makes it clear MS need to collect new data on the marine ecosystem. However, need to make the MSFD more applied. What are these new data and what are they for? Will the DCF require new data to be collected?. What exactly do policy makers want.? We cannot collect everything under the

new DCF. We need to prioritise? Who will prioritise? What are the criteria for prioritisation? There are too many things to collect?

(22). Are we currently collecting too much data under the DCF? There is a view that there are many data sets not used. There is a lot of “nice to know data” but it is not used. In a new DCF, a clear question needs to be asked for all data sets; why are we collecting it and who is using it?

(23). Those defining the DCF data to be collected need to be the data end users and not the data collectors. The needs of data end users must be identified and are critical to the new DCF. End users must also identify what they want and communicate it.

(24). An additional problem is the lack of scientists to work the data. There are not enough experts to analyse the data we collect. We need to focus on this. We need to make the DCF process (data collection, data management, assessment, advice) attractive to young scientists. We also need to invest in training.

(25). We may get a very long list of demands from the data end users. We need to reflect, see what is achievable and prioritise.

(26). DCF website is a weakness. Where can we see translations? What version is the latest NP? Where are there a complete list of recommendations? Make the website a focal point for the DCF. Invest time and resources into it. It is piecemeal today.

(27). Lot of fishermen and industry do not like the DCF. In some areas there is hostility towards the DCF. Need to involve RAC's in new DCF. Need to communicate more with industry on importance of DCF. View is held by industry that DCF restricts their fishing opportunities. There is a clear need for better communications with RAC's.

(28). Workload issue is a problem. The same people are always involved. Sometimes, the same people deal with the same issues at different meetings. This is not healthy. Need to ensure new views, thinking and problem solvers input to system. This is not easy with a limited pool of experts. Need to increase size of expert pool.

(29). Sometimes it is not always clear how data was collected under the DCF. There is a quality issue with some discard data sets. We need to address this in the new DCF.

(30). Why do we need the DCF? Why do we do it? Are we sure of these answers ?

(31). Europe is not the best in the world at managing fisheries. We don't know what we need. Fish stocks in trouble – we then look for more data ! This is bound up in CFP reform. We need to think carefully about CFP and DCF reform.

(32). In the DCF we need to audit it – decide on what is vital and what is less important. We need to improve co-ordination, we need to promote the DCF more, particularly with industry. We need better website and sharepoint facilities.

(33). We need to make the DCF more attractive scientifically in order to attract new experts who want to publish. This is a critical indicator at many institutes from where the DCF draws its experts. Can we put some focus on publishing areas related to DCF?

(34). Recommendations steer the DCF process and its evolution. We need to prioritise them or we will get bogged down. We cannot deal with all the recommendations.

(35). We need to address the wider use of DCF data to support the MSFD and NATURA. Do we collect new data sets? Who pays for this? How do we ensure that existing DCF data are used whenever possible

(added value) in the MSFD and NATURA?. The same small pool of people in MS that serve the DCF cannot deal with a massive increase in data demands.

(36) Access to data and precision of data is critical in a new DCF. We need to incorporate RAC's into DCF. We need to ensure Control Regulation data and DCF data are compatible and avoid duplication resulting in different data sets for the same subject (e.g. landings).

(37). How do we deal with discard sampling if there is a discard ban in the new CFP.? How do we respond to this. Policy changes and DCF changes must be aligned.

(38). The new DCF will require that we reflect on fishing activity over the next 7 years. what will happen? A need for high level reflection?

(39). There is an opportunity to connect the DCF world to other activities. Are we moving to a single strategy for MS embedded in Regional co-ordination of the DCF; RAC's;. reduced administrative burden; partnering between fishermen, administrative bodies and science.? We need to move to an integration of the whole system.

(40). Widening the scope of DCF will require additional funds and investment in new experts.

(41). We need central systems for data and it needs to be integrated. Currently we have RDB, FAO, Eurostat, Economic etc. data bases. Very diffuse and does not allow easy access.

(42). We need to sort out the rules regarding the DCF and data protection and human rights issues. We need to reassure. This is a delicate area and will require time and effort to get right.

(43). The new DCF has the potential to create jobs for young scientists in the research sector.

(44). The current financial climate makes it difficult for many MS to fully support data collection. This needs to be addressed; (e.g. increased % EU funding for DCF).

(45). Careful we do not unravel what we have achieved in the DCF to date. We must build on what we have achieved,.

(46). The new DCF programme will run to 2020. We need to aim for stability and design a system that will achieve that. There are a number of key issues we need to address. landlocked countries and the DCF; third countries; Human resource Issues; reflect of fisheries in its broader sense.

NOTE: The points raised above do not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission nor the EWG. The material is a record of what was said during the Brainstorming session.

Table 3.1 Original SWOT on the DCF from EWG 11-02 April 2011.

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established since 2002 • Data Availability • Common Framework • Financial Support • More transparency • Harmonisation in data collection • Introduced standards • Co-ordination and Co-operation by MS • Quality Control • Metier Approach • Bio- economic Framework • Regional Approach • Good Dialogue with EU • Included Data End User Input • Ensure redundant data are not collected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too Ambitious • Too little focus on use of data • DCF incomplete • Inefficient use of resources • Complexity • Mismatch between needs and outputs (stratification Metier Information) • Administrative Burden • Follow up of MS Actions • No Reporting website for Reference material • Metier data not used by RFMO • At sea observations - monitoring difficult (other means?) • Data quality • No catalogue of recommendations for MS • Dialogue with Data End Users could be better • DCF output driven (Data Delivery) not Results Based driven •
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maritime Policy - Support MSFD • New DCF • Surveys - Link Environmental and Fisheries Data • International exchange of experts • Improve efficiency and experts • Reduce administration burden • Regional co-operation • Driven by data end users and Managers • Integrated bio-economic advice • Cooperation with Commission /RAC/MS/RFMO • More results based approach • New CFP • Co-operation with stakehlde • Window of Opportunity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Climate • Misaligned with National Priorities • MS resource base devoted to Fisheries • Complexity of DCF • Data Deficiencies • Non Compliance • Mismatch data del data needed • Metier data not used by RFMO • Easier to adopt a “Business as usual Approach” • Historical data consistency lost

Table 3.2 Updated SWOT on the DCF (Updated from EWG 11-02 April 2011) following points raised at brainstorm session.

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established since 2002 • Data Availability • Common Framework • Financial Support • More transparency • Harmonisation in data collection • Introduced standards • Co-ordination and Co-operation by MS • Quality Control • Metier Approach • Bio- economic Framework • Regional Approach • Good Dialogue with EU • Included Data End User Input 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too Ambitious , Complex and Technical • Unbalanced in terms of detail specified for data required • Too little focus on use of data • DCF incomplete • Inefficient use of resources • Mismatch between needs and outputs (stratification Metier Information) • Administrative Burden • Follow up of MS Actions • No Reporting website for Reference material • Metier data not used by RFMO • At sea observations - monitoring difficult (other means?) • Data quality • No catalogue of recommendations for MS • Follow up of recommendations • Improve Dialogue with Data End Users • DCF output driven (Data Delivery) not Results Based driven • Poor access to some data sets • Involvement of National Correspondents • Number of Data Poor Stocks • Concurrent Sampling • Workload – expert pool is limited and same people involved all the time • Some Fishing Industry do not trust DCF

OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maritime Policy - Support MSFD • New DCF • Redefine broad principles of DCF • Surveys - Link Environmental and Fisheries Data • International exchange of experts, training • Improve efficiency and experts • Reduce administration burden and complexity • Regional co-operation • Driven by data end users and Managers • Integrated bio-economic advice • Cooperation with Commission /RAC/MS/RFMO • More results based approach • New CFP • Co-operation with stakeholders • Window of Opportunity • Task sharing • More Bilateral Agreements • Links more with RAC's and Industry • Ensure Redundant data not Collected • Synergies with Control Regulation • Improved Communication through Website • Widen scope to landlocked states • New Funding Mechanism (EMFF) • Ensure redundant data are not collected • Harmonise with non EU countries (eg Norway) • Greater integration of Med and Black Sea • Include more data on Aquaculture, freshwater fisheries • Make more attractive to young scientists – ability to publish • Create jobs for young scientists • Audit DCF – What is important – what is not important • Link DCF to other policy areas of EU that support a more regional approach • Develop Centralised Data Base • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Climate • Misaligned with National Priorities • MS resource base devoted to Fisheries • Complexity of DCF • Data Deficiencies • Non Compliance • Mismatch data delivered - data needed • Metier data not used by RFMO • Easier to adopt a “Business as usual Approach” • Historical data consistency lost • Changing Policy Landscape • Including more on Aquaculture and Freshwater fisheries could make more complex • Unravel what was achieved in DCF • Data Protection and Human rights

The views of two major data end users, ICES and GFCM

DATA END USER - ICES

Poal Dengbol (Head of Advisory Programme, ICES) outlined the ICES view on the DCF. He outlines various issues related to the DCF including data quality and data availability issues. The objectives of the new DCF must be linked with the objectives of a reformed CFP, integrated with other policies such as the MSFD and the Habitats Directive and also linked with the objectives of the RFMO's. There must also be more emphasis on ecosystem aspects such as biodiversity and ecosystem health and functioning and to fisheries approaches (as opposed to fish stock approaches). Socio economic aspects must also be better integrated. The new DCF should also consider a more regional approach, more efficient stratification, better data access, reduced observer bias and adapt to new conditions while maintaining time series. The New DCF must address the data access issue and improve access for advisers, scientists and public debate. There will also be a requirement to look at new data types related to biodiversity, food webs (e.g. new stomach data) and habitat impacts (e.g. multi purpose TV surveys).

The full text from the ICES presentation is given below.

1 Expectations in the DCF

1. Nearly open access
 2. Inclusion of data from data collection and control/monitoring/surveillance
 3. Access to spatial resolution as need for spatial management
 4. Reduction of bias – mandatory observer access
 5. Underpins mixed fisheries/effort analysis (metier approach)
 6. Inclusion of ecosystem approach data
 7. Inclusion of socio/econ data
 8. Possibilities for permanent data bases (no time limit)
 9. Support to transformation to advice (analysis)
 10. Stronger control/sanction instruments
 11. Negative: based on national programmes – limited framework for regional optimisation and regional data bases / data use
- Nearly open access
 - Major achievement, has opened for research community use and for advisory bodies beyond STECF
 - No access to data prior to 2009. Makes timelines for analysis very short initially
 - Researchers have found poor response from MS / difficult for COM to enforce access
 - Data access difficult in practice due to technical complexities (multiple formats etc)
 - Underpins mixed fisheries/effort analysis (metier approach)
 - Usefull for effort regulation advice
 - METIER BASED APPROACH. The practice of quota sampling to achieve a desired sample size (e.g. number of trips) in métiers may result in biased estimates of key parameters (from WKPRECISE);
 - METIER BASED APPROACH. Temporally dynamic metier definitions are an inefficient basis for stratification schemes. This can lead to over-stratification and problems of under-sampling or non-sampling of strata, and poor control over sampling probabilities (from WKMERGE);
 - Inclusion of data from data collection and control/monitoring/surveillance

- Access to VMS data easier
 - Some reservations, problems to link VMS data to logbook data
- Better spatial resolution
 - Data have been available (Natura 2000 etc)
- Reduction of bias – mandatory observer access
 - Still bias problems, Has this ever been used ?
- Inclusion of ecosystem approach data
 - Indicators are now concluded and underpinned by data collection
 - Time series still short
- Inclusion of socio/econ data
 - (ICES not end user)
- Possibilities for permanent data bases (no time limit)
 - National approach made establishments of regional databases difficult
- Support to analysis / transformation to advice (??)
- Stronger control/sanction instruments
 - More efficient enforcement

2 Data quality issues

- Landings
 - Inconsistency between sources / tolerances
 - Non-reporting
 - Misreporting (area, species)
 - Insufficient or non-representative biological sampling coverage
- Discards
 - No reporting
 - Insufficient observer coverage
 - Coverage bias
- Effort
 - Non-availability
 - Poor linkage to fishing practice / metier
 - Poor comparability
- Stock surveys
 - Coverage, design, consistency in time
- Biological data
 - Bias /errors in measurements of age, maturity
 - Uncertain stock identity
- Perception / Model uncertainties (not data issues) – natural mortality, stock mixing, recruitment etc

3 Data Availability 2010

EU member states: Data Collection Framework

Non-EU countries : Data collected in accordance with coordinated schemes

Surveys: most coordinated through ICES

Data assembled for Expert Groups through stock coordinator

Some data not collected or not reported to ICES expert groups

Some data could not be used due to quality issues
Some data did not have sufficient coverage in space/time to be useful

4 The New DCF

Start from objectives:

- Objectives of reformed CFP
- Integration with other policies (MSFD, Habitats)
- Objectives in international bodies (mainly RFMOs)

Expectation – more emphasis on:

- ecosystem aspects – biodiversity, ecosystem health and functioning
- fisheries approaches (contrary to stock approaches)
- socio economic aspects

Issues for new DCF

- Regional approach
- Integration with ecosystem approach
- Efficient stratification
- Better data access
- Reduce Observer bias
- Adaptable to new conditions while maintaining time series

Regional Approach

- Regional optimisation
 - Resources
 - Stats
- Regional data bases
 - DCF data
 - CMS data
 - Better options for linking data

Stratification and adaptability

- Stratification/sampling strategy to ensure that data can efficiently be used for
 - Single stock advice
 - Multi stock interactions advice
 - Mixed fisheries advice
 - Effort management advice
 - Spatial management advice
 - Advice regarding ecosystem impacts
- Adaptable with continuity in time series
 - Adaptable to changing ecosystems and changing fisheries
 - Enabling temporally consistent time series

Data access

Improve (at least maintain) access for advisers, scientists and public debate
Access to data prior to 2009

Means for easy access to standard data types – framework for use of regional data bases for data access for scientific community and advisory bodies

Reduce observer bias

- Regional plans with targets for observer coverage incl. use of mandatory access

New data types?

- D1 - Biodiversity: ensure coverage of relevant biota, integrated surveys
- D4 - Food webs: new stomach data? Isotopes?
- D6 - Habitat impacts: multi-purpose TV surveys?

DATA END USER - GFCM

Mr. Federico De Rossi from the GFCM Secretariat delivered a presentation on the GFCM Regional Information Systems by highlighting the nine components of the GFCM data collection framework: Aquaculture-SIPAM, Dolphin Fish, IUU vessel list, Red Coral, Registered Ports, STATLANT 37A, Task 1, Vessel Records, VMS.

He underlined that all of them, except Statlant which is an FAO commitment, has been released in support of GFCM binding recommendations since they imply obligations for GFCM members countries to submit data according to data requirements, formats and protocols laid down in such decisions.

Of particular relevance to the EU DCF are the Vessel Records¹ and the Task 1 Operational Units, the multidisciplinary data collection scheme aiming at collecting information on fleet capacity, economic data, fishing activities, resources targeted, catch and effort, biology.

Mr. De Rossi informed participants that although the biological component is already mandatory for GFCM members countries, it would be probably matter of debate for its improvement in terms of streamlined data submission workflow. This issue together with other relevant topics will be discussed during the next GFCM Sub-Committees meetings (23-26 January 2012, Rome) whose participation is opened to experts may wish to contribute.

He concluded his intervention by underling that GFCM Task 1 Information System could be an efficient example of regional database for the Mediterranean and Black Sea within the EC scenario.

He concluded by stating that GFCM is looking forward to participate to other similar event which would contribute to strengthen the collaboration between GFCM and EC.

¹ *It includes information on Fisheries Restricted Area in the Gulf of Lions (FRA), Minimum mesh size in the cod-end of demersal trawlers (MMS), Regional Fleet Register (RFR), Record of Vessels over 15 meters authorized to operate in the GFCM Area (AVL)*

7 SECTION 4 - ADDRESSING TOR 3

Comments made by STECF

TOR 3. Comments made by STECF

To review the comments made by of STECF during the April, July and November 2011 plenary meetings in relation to the new DCF. In particular on the following issues will be dealt with:

- ***Data Deficiencies*** *To present the state of play of user's feed back and develop further ideas of how to improve the current situation regarding efficiency and feasibility of data calls.*
- ***New species, deep sea species*** *To examine new species and deep species can be better integrated into the current sampling frames.*

There was much time devoted to strategic discussions on the DCF at EWG 11-02 (Ispra, April 2011) and at EWG 11- 08 (Helsinki; July 2011). The group reviewed the comments and recommendations made by STECF during their plenary meetings in 2011, in relation to these EWG's with a focus on the new DCF, data deficiencies and how new species/deep sea species could be better integrated into the current sampling frame.

The approach taken by the group was to develop a table of the key comments and recommendations made by STECF in relation to the revision of the DCF. The group recognized that 2012 will be a critical year in establishing the new DCF and that this table should be consulted by the Commission (and others) to ensure that key decisions made in 2011 are incorporated into discussions on the new DCF in 2012.

Following feedback from the Commission. the group concluded that the issue of data requirements for new species and deep water species should be an integral part of the data end user feedback in the DCF review (driven by data end users and not data collectors).

EWG 11-19 recommends that the 18 issues outlined in the Table below are included in the discussion on a new DCF during the early part of 2012.

Table 4.1**Review of 2011 STECF Comments and Recommendations in relation to the DCF**

The following table gives the DCF related comments and recommendations made by STECF during their 2011 Plenary meetings (Two issues -highlighted in pink - are sourced from EWG 11-02 and EWG 10-03).

Number	DCF Issue	COMMENT	STECF Meeting	Follow Up
1	Research Surveys	STECF recommends that financial support be found to investigate the potential for surveys that are funded under the DCF to be adapted to maximize their utility in providing information to support other frameworks (e.g. MSFD)	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission Early 2012
2	Survey Atlas	Issue 1 should address the need for a survey atlas , definition of data needs and priorities, the development of designed-for-purpose surveys and the integration of DCF funded and other surveys. National Correspondents/national representatives in ICES, GFCM or other relevant national authorities ensure that information on all surveys performed in their national marine waters are made available for this task.	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission Early 2012
3	Data End User Feedback	STECF recommends that the follow up of data end user feedback needs to be improved. This could be achieved by setting up a more formal institutional system to manage the dialogue between end users, National Programmes and DG MARES. STECF suggests that as a first step, a common database that facilitates the transmission of recommendations on data issues should be established by the Commission with input from the RCM.	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission During 2012
4	Metier and Fleet Segment Definition	STECF recognize that improved consistency in métier and fleet segment definition used in the DCF and the management system is needed. STECF recommends that the flexibility to aggregate information in different ways to address the wide and evolving range of management issues is introduced in the DCF.	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission During 2012
5	Regional Data Bases	STECF recommends that RDB are considered in a revision of the present DCF and that efforts are made by the Commission to facilitate the use of RDB.	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission During 2012

6	Control Regulation	<p>STECF recommends that overlap in the CR and the DCF should be avoided. Data collected under the CR should not be included in the DCF unless it is to be expected that the quality of the data collected under the CR does not fulfil the quality requirements of the DCF. STECF further recommends including in the new DCF commitments for MS to set up at national or regional level, a system to encourage cooperation between control authorities and the NP of the DCF. This co-operation system should address all issues of relevance for the collection and processing of data to be collected under the CR and the DCF.</p>	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission During 2012
7	Sampling of Vessels Not Subject to	<p>The CR includes commitments for MS to develop and implement sampling plans for vessels not subject to logbook requirements and landings declarations. STECF recommends that when MS develop the sampling plans, due notice is taken to the data requirements under the DCF. This could be done by actively involving at national level, the DCF experts in the development of the sampling plans.</p>	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission During 2012
8	Formal Data Calls	<p>STECF supports the proposal for a formal data call as recommended by EWG 11-08. STECF recommends that ICES and the Commission carefully check the legal basis for such requests, in order to prevent that MS can refuse data delivery to ICES.</p>	37 th SECF Plenary July 2011	Commission During 2012
9	Metier Data	<p>STECF notes that métier based DCF data are still in many cases underutilized by ICES stock assessment working groups, as data are often provided by country only and not by métier and in such cases the raising methodology does not make appropriate use of DCF sampling strata. Furthermore, STECF notes that there is insufficient knowledge about basic data processes within ICES assessment expert groups. STECF recommends that the provision of métier based data, including a description of the raising methodology used will be presented by the data collectors. STECF suggests that a pilot data set for mixed demersal gadoid fisheries in the North Sea be prepared by the RCM in September 2011.</p>	37 th SECF Plenary July 2011	RCM 2011

10	Recommendations by Region	STECF regards the compilation of regional recommendations as an integral part of the RCM's and will compile the STECF recommendations as laid out in the April 2011 Plenary Report	37 th SECF Plenary July 2011	STECF in 2012
11	Roadmap for DCF Revisions	STECF recommends that EWG 11-19 reconsiders the proposal in the light of recent developments and timelines in the legislative framework of the CFP reform.	37 th SECF Plenary July 2011	EWG 11-19 Late 2011 Commission and STECF Early 2012
12	SWOT	STECF concurred that the SWOT analysis (April 2011) should be an important input to the strategic planning process for the revision of the DCF. This will be updated by EWG 11 -19	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission During 2012
13	Research Vessel Surveys and Ecosystem Approach	STECF noted that ICES Working Group on integrated surveys for the Ecosystem Approach (WGISUR) has the ongoing remit to develop surveys to be applicable to the ecosystem approach. STECF recognizes that it is important to make use of existing structures that address priority key issues. The concept of expanding the scope of existing DCF funded fisheries surveys to include MSFD data collection raises the critical issue of survey design and the purpose of the survey. Given that vessel time is by far the most expensive component in costs of the DCF, STECF notes that it would be appropriate to examine what scale of integrated survey would be possible with the current commitment of vessel time by MS.	Commission During 2012	Commission During 2012
14	DCF Principles	EWG 11-02 revisited the principles of the DCR/DCF and looked at the previous comments of STECF in relation to these principles. EWG11-02 concluded that the following issues should be addressed in a revision of the DCF; (1) Intense co-ordination of data needs with data end users; (2) Thorough review of statistical properties of sampling; (3) Workshop on integration of MSFD data needs into the DCF.	EWG 11-02	Commission During 2012
15	Current Financial Crisis	EWG11-02 highlighted that all MS are affected by the current financial crisis and exposed to reductions in the national budgets. In some cases this has made it more difficult to comply with requirements of the DCF. A further expansion of the DCF, without considering the financial consequences, would exacerbate this problem.	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission During 2012

16	Aggregation of Economic Data	Economic data available from the DCF often do not have the right level of detail to feed into bioeconomic models and evaluate and compare specific management measures at the level of métier and sub areas. The behavior of fishermen , changing their fishing patterns based on costs/earnings in different métier/areas cannot be taken into account. STECF noted that these issues are of major importance in evaluation of the effectiveness of measures and their economic consequences and that harmonization of biological, technical and economic segmentation is required in a revised DCF.	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission During 2012
17	Impact Assessment and Evaluation of Multi Annual Plans	STECF concluded that a key area to be considered in a revised DCF is the necessity for the DCF to provide all basic data necessary for calculation of indicators used for impact assessment and evaluation of Multi Annual Management Plans .	36 th STECF Plenary April 2011	Commission During 2012
18	Review of Surveys	During discussions on the DCF revisions, EWG 11-19 recommended that the recommendations made by EWG 10-03 on the Review of Surveys should form a key component of the survey discussions.	EWG 11-19	Commission During 2012

8 SECTION 5 - ADDRESSING TOR 4

Incorporation of comments made by the RCM and 8th LM

TOR 4. Comments made by the RCM's and 8th LM

To review the comments and action points made by the 2011 RCM's and the 8th Liaison Meeting in order to ensure that these recommendations are followed up.

There were three specific recommendations from the 8th LM that were addressed to EWG 11-19. These related to establishment of regional/bilateral agreements and an apparent conflict in the recommendations from the RCM Baltic and RCM North Atlantic (Recommendation LM 6 and LM 28) and the issue of concurrent sampling (Recommendation LM 24).

Regional/Bilateral Agreements

LM 6 - Métier related variables: Regional agreements on framework for the analysis of landings abroad	
RCM Baltic 2011 Agreement	<p>In order to identify were bilateral agreements on sampling of foreign landings have to be set up, the RCM Baltic agreed on a common understanding of thresholds for sampling. It was agreed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• that 200 tonnes limit exemption rule (2010/93/EU B2.1.5) is applied also for foreign landings• that species where less than 5% of a member state's total landings are landed abroad are excluded (corresponding to the application of 1639/2001)• that if No. of samples according the old DCR (1639/2001 appendix XV) are 3 or less, there is no need for sampling of the landings by the landing country and can instead be sampled by the flag country. Also, in these cases no formal agreement needs to be set up.• that the analysis on when bilateral agreements are needed should be done annually by the RCM using landing data from the previous year.
Followed actions needed	Approval by the LM and secondly the Commission should be contacted for acceptance of this proposal
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	The Chair of the RCM Baltic
LM 2011 comment	LM recommends that this issue is dealt with by STECF EWG 11-19, as different rules were proposed by RCM NA.

LM 28 - Métier related variables: Routines for establishing bilateral agreements	
RCM NA 2011 Recommendation	<p>In order to identify where bilateral agreements on sampling of foreign landings have to be set up, the RCM NA proposes a common understanding of thresholds for sampling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ where less than 5% of a member state's total landings, sampling of landings abroad are excluded (corresponding to the application of 1639/2001), given that the other 95% of the landings are sufficiently sampled by the landing countries for the relevant métier(s) ▪ the analysis on when bilateral agreements are needed, should be done annually by the RCM using landing data from the previous year
Follow-up actions	DG MARE and STECF to reflect on this m
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DG MARE and STECF
Time frame (Deadline)	2012
LM 2011 comments	LM recommends that this issue is dealt with by STECF EWG 11-19, as different rules were proposed by RCM Baltic.

A small Sub Group made up of members of RCM Baltic and RCM NA examined the apparent conflict in the issues raised in LM recommendation 6 and LM recommendation 28. The following text clarifies the position.

RCM Baltic and RCM NA both proposed a procedure to identify where bilateral agreements on sampling of foreign landings have to be set up. RCM NA reflecting on the issue after RCM Baltic had a different view, but it appeared that the rule proposed by RCM Baltic was set for the biological parameters whereas the rules set by RCM NA would apply to métier related variables. Eventually, LM agreed to propose the following:

For metier related variables (RCM NA proposal) a bilateral agreement must be set up;

where less than 5% of a member state's total landings are landed abroad, sampling is excluded from the obligation of sampling abroad (corresponding to the application of 1639/2001) if the other 95% of the landings are sufficiently sampled by the landing countries for the relevant métier(s).

The reference period to be used in the analysis should be the latest available reference year.

For biological variables (RCM Baltic proposal) it was agreed

that 200 tonnes limit exemption rule (2010/93/EU B2.1.5) is applied also for foreign landings

that species where less than 5% of a member state's total landings are landed abroad are excluded (corresponding to the application of 1639/2001)

that if No. of samples according the old DCR (1639/2001appendix XV) are 3 or less, there is no need for sampling of the landings by the landing country and can instead be sampled by the flag country. Also, in these cases no formal agreement needs to be set up.

that the analysis on when bilateral agreements are needed should be done annually by the RCM using landing data from the previous year.

Original proposals from both RCM reports:

RCM Baltic proposed the following procedure in order to identify where bilateral agreements on sampling of foreign landings have to be set up, the RCM Baltic agreed on a common understanding of thresholds for sampling. It was agreed

- that 200 tonnes limit exemption rule (2010/93/EU B2.1.5) is applied also for foreign landings
- that species where less than 5% of a member state's total landings are landed abroad are excluded (corresponding to the application of 1639/2001)
- that if No. of samples according the old DCR (1639/2001appendix XV) are 3 or less, there is no need for sampling of the landings by the landing country and can instead be sampled by the flag country. Also, in these cases no formal agreement needs to be set up.
- that the analysis on when bilateral agreements are needed should be done annually by the RCM using landing data from the previous year.

The RCM NA further discussed this proposal and agreed that a threshold needed to be applied to sort out when MS have obligations to sample and consequently bilateral agreements should be set up, using the outcome of the RCM Baltic 2011 as a starting point. The following options were discussed:

The 200 tonnes exemption rule in DCF stock sampling (2010/93/EU B2.1.5) applies to biological parameters, and can not be applied in the context of sampling landings abroad according to the RCM NA (as opposed to the opinion of the RCM Baltic) because of the recent shift to metier sampling instead of stock sampling.

where less than 5% of a member state's total landings are landed abroad, sampling is excluded from the obligation of sampling abroad (corresponding to the application of 1639/2001) if the other 95% of the landings are sufficiently sampled by the landing countries for the relevant metier(s).

The notion that if the number of samples is 3 or less (according to the future analysis), the sampling of the MS where the species were landed can be switched off and the landings should instead be sampled in the flag MS, is not supported by the RCM NA 2011. The reason is the loss of possibility to identify a potential different landing structure which would bias the estimates.

The reference period to be used in the analysis should be the latest available reference year, instead of an average from a longer period of time, this because the trends for landings can change fast.

Concurrent Sampling

LM 24 - Metier and stock variables : Concurrent sampling	
RCM NA 2011 Recommendation	MS to fill in template on concurrent sampling and provide it to the chair of RCM NA for compilation and sending to the chair of STECF EWG 11-19 in advance of the December meeting
Follow-up actions needed	MS to fill the template Chair of RCM NA to compile all questionnaires and sent them to the chair of STECF EWG 11-19
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS, chair of RCM NA
Time frame (Deadline)	November 31 2011
LM 2011 comments	LM supports this recommendation and notes that the deadline for submission of questionnaires should be 15 November 2011 in order to allow compilation of information before STECF EWG 11-19.

A small majority of the countries who filled the questionnaire (5 out of 8) implemented the concurrent sampling on-shore, some adding the information that they implemented concurrent sampling also at-sea, others that they took some liberty with the scheme as defined in the DCF. Three countries departed from non-concurrent sampling scheme, because of cost and labour intensive and time window too restricted to sample concurrently (Belgium, Netherlands), because of specific methodologies (Scotland) or because the main fishery is already sampled at-sea (Belgium).

Concurrent sampling on-shore is usually implemented in all sites and for all fleets, but there are some exceptions to the rule, mainly due to the accessibility to certain sampling sites. For these sampling sites, one solution proposed was to carry on commercial category sampling.

The question on which level the concurrent sampling was implemented gathered more diverse answers. For 3 countries (UK, Ireland, Spain), the sampling of all species landed is the only rule, but it is said that sampling may be lowered to the other schemes on a case by case depending on the practical issues encountered (UK). The other countries have a different scheme by fishery, and the rationale is not given, but either it is based on the importance of the fishery (Portugal) or on the diversity of species landed (France). One country (France) has implemented recently a special scheme for elasmobranchs because they are the species (i) the most time consuming to sample, (ii) requiring the most precise expertise on the species identification and (iii) because this helps the sampling teams to concentrate on all other species.

Problems encountered	Solutions applied by MS
Insufficient time window or difficulty to cover all species landed	In general concurrent sampling is dependent on the time window and staff available. For UK, sampling is not undertaken if insufficient access or time. Ireland proposed to add personnel to sampling teams, but expressed that this was not always possible. France adapted the sampling scheme with a restricted list of species. In Spain, shift to on-board sampling was the solution in some cases.
Access to live shellfish species from most metiers.	Landings of each shellfish species from the same trip can be made at different times to other components and only be available if at all at different sites. Only solution is to intercept the landings of each component from the same trip, which could be at different times of the day or week.
Unable to access all of the species landed due to splitting of catches	Unable to solve or sampling for commercial categories
Catches landed directly into lorries.	No solution
Huge increase in the number of strata and species to be sampled	In Portugal such increase led to a lower number of samples collected for the species already sampled, with a decrease on the precision of the estimates being used for single-species assessments. The effect of the implementation of concurrent sampling is clear: the number of trips and individuals sampled decreased, while the number of species and individuals sampled by trip increased. Portugal expressed that the full implementation of the concurrent sampling, as defined in the current DCF, would have required a significant increase in staff and other resources
Extra difficulties in the access to some fish, specially coastal species of greater commercial value and very delicate fishes which reach high prices in the market.	Ship owners do not like that the fish is handled before the sale specially when it's already organized in the boxes. No solution proposed.

The problems encountered and solutions proposed are presented in the table above. In terms of advantages gained over previous sampling schemes, countries were somehow disagreeing. Some expressed there were no advantages (UK) or no advantages from a stock assessment point of view (Ireland) because stock assessment is done on a single-stock basis. UK acknowledged that concurrent sampling helped improving industry awareness. For France, concurrent sampling increased the number of landing sites for all species and provided information on more stocks (Belgium expressed the same view for concurrent sampling at-sea).

From the end-user perspective, it seems that because concurrent sampling of landings requires more resources than species-specific sampling, sample numbers are lower and precision is lower. Some expressed concerns about the impact on the sampling levels of individual stocks for assessment purposes. Some experts refuse to level down their sampling, so countries (France) had to add stock-specific

sampling for some stocks. The question is raised on cost efficiency of sampling stocks where there is no assessment or stocks where the total measured will be too low at the end of the year

Suggestions for improvement or modification

There is a consensus that the current scheme should be modified to better suit the fisheries, precision and assessment needs. Two countries proposed to drop concurrent sampling on-shore and that DCF should set up objectives and leave the countries free on their ways to achieve the goals. France proposed to adapt the current scheme by restricting the list of species to sample an-shore and has split the sampling into two schemes, namely the elasmobranchs and the non-elasmobranchs sampling. On another issue, Portugal presented a methodology to PGCCDBS 2011 for estimating the number of samples and number of individuals to collect in order to achieve a target precision.

EWG Recommendation

The dedicated workshop on concurrent sampling (WKISCON, ICES 2008) recalled the original idea that concurrent length sampling of landings ashore could be considered as a supplement to sampling at sea, and [could] be combined with sampling of length compositions of the retained catches sampled at sea where appropriate. STECF/EWG acknowledges the fact that concurrent sampling on-shore faced implementation difficulties leading to accommodation of the scheme as defined in the Commission Decision or impossibility to sample concurrently. This situation is different from on-board sampling, where concurrent sampling still remains the rule and the code of good practice. In conclusion, for on-shore sampling, this EWG is of the opinion that MS should continue to sample the métiers and make sure to cover all the species/stocks where a demand is formulated by an end-user (or listed in Appendix VII of the Comm. Dec.), but the methodology used to achieve the goals remains at the discretion of the MS, provided that it is fully documented and approved within their NP proposal.

The issue of concurrent sampling will be reviewed in relation to the requirements of the new DCF.

9 SECTION 6 - ADDRESSING TOR 5

Review of Progress on Regional Data Bases

TOR 5. Regional Data Bases

To review progress on the development of regional databases following the RDB Workshop and discussions at the RCM and LM.

Neil Holsworth (ICES data manager) gave a brief overview of progress in relation to the RDB. ICES are now co-ordinating the RDB and good progress has been made in 2011. The Regional Data Base Steering Group (RDBSC) will meet on 2nd December 2011 to discuss progress in relation to the RDB and proposed work for 2012.

The RDBSC will

1. Summarise progress in the development of the RDB in 2011
 - a) Review the status on the budget and the MoU negotiations between ICES and COM.
 - b) Review the status on documentation and bug-fixing.
 - c) Review the status on workshops and planning
2. Respond on recommendations put forward to the SC by the Liaison meeting in order to report back to the regional coordination meetings (RCMs) in 2012
 - d) Discuss, plan and initiate the preparation of a proposal of a data policy document dealing with data confidentiality and data ownership issues.
 - e) Prepare and establish a list of development needs for the RDB, including time for such developments, enabling prioritization at the RCM/LM level.
 - f) Conclude on the experiences of the data calls 2011. report from RCM chairs on usability and issues (defined in RCM report text)
3. Establish and agree on procedures for the future work of the steering committee
 - g) Establish and agree on a governance model for the RDB
Based on existing proposed governance model and 'overall process' described in 2e
 - h) Establish and agree on generic ToRs for future SC meetings (for 2012 should be in CPH)
 - i) Establish list of Members in the SC, including alternates
 - j) Agree on meeting frequency including potential need of inter-sessional web based meetings
- 4) Agree on a road-map for 2012, including
 - k) Date for commencement of physical migration from DTU Aqua to ICES

EWG 11-19 thanked NH for the update and commended the progress made. The group strongly supports the current work on the RDB and emphasized the importance of the RDB to the current DCF and the new DCF.

10 SECTION 7 - ADDRESSING TOR 6

Proposed DCF Meetings in 2012

TOR 6. Proposed DCF Meetings in 2012

To develop a schedule and list of DCF EWG meetings for 2012 with emphasis on the new DCF, review of AR and the NP 2013. This list will be considered by STECF and the Commission in developing the meeting schedule for 2012.

Table 7.1 A proposed schedule for STECF EWG meetings on the DCF in 2012

DATE	DCF	Meeting	Comments
<i>December 2011</i>	<i>ISSUE PAPER ON NEW DCF</i>		<i>Commission Paper Circulated</i>
<i>Jan 2012</i>		<i>STECF Bureau</i>	<i>Decide on DCF EWG Meetings for 2012</i>
<i>March 2012</i>	<i>All Data End Users On Objectives, Scope out New DCF</i>	<i>EWG 01 Revision of DCF</i>	<i>Data End users Memberr States Commission</i>
<i>March 2012</i>		<i>STECF PLENARY</i>	<i>DCF Progress Decisions</i>
<i>March 2012</i>	<i>OPINION PAPER On NEW DCF</i>		<i>Commission Internal Paper Circulated</i>
<i>May 2012</i>	<i>Annual Report 2011</i>	<i>Submission by MS</i>	
<i>May 2012</i>	<i>Surveys, Socio Economics, Data Format, Standardization Regional Cooperation</i>	<i>EWG 02 Revision of DCF</i>	<i>Issue driven Work by Sub Groups</i>
<i>June 2012</i>	<i>Annual Reports 2011</i>	<i>EWG 03 Evaluation of Annual Reports</i>	<i>Pre Screening prior to Meeting</i>
<i>June 2012</i>	<i>MAP 2014 to 2020</i>		
<i>July</i>		<i>STECF PLENARY</i>	<i>DCF Progress Decisions</i>
<i>October 2012</i>	<i>Revisions to 2013 NP</i>	<i>Submission by MS</i>	
<i>October 2012</i>	<i>Final text of NP</i>		
<i>????</i>	<i>RCM's</i>	<i>???</i>	
<i>??</i>	<i>LM</i>	<i>???</i>	
<i>November 2012</i>	<i>Revised NP</i>	<i>EWG 04 Evaluation of Revised 2013 NP</i>	<i>Commission to Provide Revision Guidelines</i>
<i>November 2012</i>		<i>STECF Plenary</i>	<i>DCF Progress Decisions</i>
<i>December 2012</i>	<i>Adoption of New DCF</i>		

ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Scientific Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)
Expert Working Group (EWG)**

STECF – EWG 11- 19 Meeting

28th November to 1st December 2011

Brussels, Belgium

Terms of Reference

TOR 1. Evaluation of revised 2012 National Programmes.

To evaluate the 2012 National Programmes (NP) submitted under the new Data Collection Framework (Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008) using the new Guidelines and Procedures developed in SGRN 09-03. The evaluation will be based on the overarching criteria of conformity and scientific relevance. It will also consider the performance of the guidelines for submission of NPs and, where necessary, make appropriate recommendations for their improvement. The 2011 to 2013 NP have already been evaluated (SGRN 10-01) and this review will focus on revisions made by MS to the original programmes.

TOR 2. SWOT Analysis of DCF

To evaluate the performance of the DCF since 2008 in order to develop input for the preparation of the post 2013 data collection legal framework. This exercise shall build on the analysis conducted by EWG 11-02 and produce an updated overview of the strength and weaknesses of the current system and develop ideas for possible changes in the post 2013 DCF. This exercise will also draw on relevant comments made by STECF during their 2011 plenary meetings.

TOR 3. Comments made by STECF

To review the comments made by of STECF during the April, July and November 2011 plenary meetings in relation to the DCF.

In particular on the following issues will be dealt with:

- **Data Deficiencies** To present the state of play of user's feed back and develop further ideas of how to improve the current situation regarding efficiency and feasibility of data calls.

- **New species, deep sea species** To examine new species and deep species can be better integrated into the current sampling frames.

TOR 4. Comments made by the RCM's and 8th LM

To review the comments and action points made by the 2011 RCM's and the 8th Liaison Meeting in order to ensure that these recommendations are followed up.

TOR 5. Regional Data Bases

To review progress on the development of regional databases following the RDB Workshop and discussions at the RCM and LM.

TOR 6. Proposed DCF Meetings in 2012

To develop a schedule and list of DCF EWG meetings for 2012 with emphasis on the new DCF, review of AR and the NP 2013. This list will be considered by STECF and the Commission in developing the meeting schedule for 2012.

ANNEX 2 - MEETING AGENDA

Scientific Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

Expert Working Group (EWG 11-19 Meeting)

28th November to 1st December 2011

Brussels, Belgium

AGENDA

(Draft Version 2)

Monday 28th November (Day 1)

13.00hrs	PLENARY
	Welcome and Logistics
	Meeting Agenda and Roadmap
	Meeting Objectives
	Views of the Commission
	Future of the DCF
	Review of NP 2012 – The Job that needs to be Done.
	The Meeting Report – Structure
	Appointment of Rapporteurs for TOR 2 to 6
	Review of NP 2012 (TOR 1) – Approach – Methodology
	Formation of Sub Groups (Chairs and Rapporteurs)
	Discussion
15.00 to 17.50 hrs	Sub Groups Begin Work – Checking of NP 2012 (TOR 1)
17.50 hrs	Summary of Day 1
18.00 hrs	Close of Day 1

Tuesday 29th November (Day 2)

09.00 to 09.10 hrs PLENARY – Plan for Day 2
09.10 to 16.00 hrs Sub Groups – Checking of NP 2012 (TOR 1)
16.00 to 17.50 hrs PLENARY - Report of Sub Group Chairs
17.50 to 18.00 hrs Summary of Day 2
18.00 hrs Finish Day 2

Wednesday 30th November (Day 3)

09.00 to 09.15 hrs PLENARY – Plan for Day 3
09.15 to 11.00 hrs Finalise Sub Group Work – Review NP 2012 (TOR 2)
11.00 to 12.00 hrs Issues that Emerged during Review of NP 2012
12.00 to 13.00 hrs BUFFER
13.00 to 14.00 hrs LUNCH
14.00 to 16.00 hrs DCF Comments by STECF Plenaries in 2011(TOR 3)
Ensuring Follow up
Discussion
16.00 to 17.00 hrs Comments made by the RCM and 8th LM (TOR 4)
Ensuring Follow Up
Discussion
17.00 to 17.50 hrs Proposed DCF Related Meetings in 2012 (TOR 6)
Draft for Consideration by STECF and Commission .
17.50 hrs Summary of Day 3

18.00 hrs Close of Day 2

Thursday 1st December (Day 4)

09.10 to 09.15 hrs PLENARY – Plan for Day 4

09.15 to 12.00 hrs SWOT Analysis of the DCF (TOR 3)

Addressing the Issues Raised in the SWOT (EWG 11-02)

Key Issues to consider in a new DCF

Discussion

12.00 to 13.00 hrs Regional Data Base – Review Progress (TOR 5)

Next Steps

Discussion

13.00 to 14.00 hrs LUNCH

14.00 – 16.00 hrs The Report – Drafting of Text by Rapporteurs

16.00 to 17.00 hrs A First Look at the Draft Report

17.00 to 17.50 Review of Action Points for each TOR

Have we addressed our TOR's

The Draft Report – Presentation to STECF

Concluding Comments from the Commission

17.50 hrs Final Comments from Chair

18.00 hrs Meeting Close

ANNEX 3 - CONTACT DETAILS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Name	Institute	Address	Email
Invited experts			
Angeles Armesto	Instituto Español de Oceanografía	Cabo Estay-Canido, 36200 Vigo Spain	angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es
Paolo Carpentieri	MIPAF	Viale dell'Università 32, 185 Rome Italy	paolo.carpentieri@unroma1.it
Paul Connolly	The Marine Institute	Oranmore 1, Galway Ireland	paul.connolly@marine.ie
Jørgen Dalskov	DTU-Aqua	Charlottenlund Slot, DK-2920 Charlottenlund Denmark	jd@aqua.dtu.dk
Marina Dias	IPIMAR - National Laboratory of Marine Research	Av. Brasília 1449-006 LISBOA Portugal	mdias@ipimar.pt
Michael Ebeling	Institute for Seafishery	Palmaille 9, 22767 Hamburg Germany	Michael.Ebeling@vti.bund.de
Leyre Goti	Independent expert	General Concha 44, 4ºcentro izda, 48012 Bilbao Spain	leyregoti@yahoo.com
Joel Vigneau	IFREMER	Avenue du General de Gaulle, 14520 Port-en-Bessin France	Joel.Vigneau@ifremer.fr
Francesca Gravino	Agriculture and Fisheries Regulation Department	Fort San Lucjan, BBG 1283 Marsaxlokk, Malta	francesca.gravino@gov.mt
Edvardas Kazlauskas	Agriinformation and Rural Business Center	V. Kudirkos str. 18, LT03105 Vilnius Lithuania	edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt
Emmanuil Koutrakis	NAGREF_Fisheries Research Institute	Nea Peramos, 64007 Kavala Greece	manosk@inale.gr
Ari Leskelä	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute	Yliopistokatu 6, 80100 Joensuu Finland	ari.leskela@rktl.fi
Gráinne Ní Chonchúir	The Marine Institute	Rinville, Oranmore Co. Galway Ireland	grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie
Gheorghe Radu	NIMRD "Grigore Antipa" Constanta	Mamaia 300, 900581 CONSTANTARomania	gpr@alpha.rmri.ro

Tiit Raid	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu		
Katja Ringdahl	Swedish Agricultural University	Box 4, 453 21 Lysekil Sweden	katja.ringdahl@fiskeriverket.se
Pieter-Jan Schön	Agri-Food & Biosciences Institute	Newforge Lane, BT9 5PX Belfast United Kingdom	pieter-jan.schon@afbini.gov.uk
Romas Statkus	Fishery research laboratory	P. O. Box 108, 91001 Klaipeda Lithuania	statrom@gmail.com
Constantin Stroie	National Agency for Fisheries and Aquaculture of R	54, Eufrosina Popescu Str. 75436 Bucharest Romania	cststroie@yahoo.com
Els Torreele	ILVO Fisheries		els.torreele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Darcelle Vassallo	Agriculture and Fisheries Regulation Department	Fort San Lucjan, BBG 1283 Marsaxlokk Malta	darcelle.vassallo@gov.mt
Sieto Verver	IMARES	PO Box 68, 1970 AB Ijmuiden Netherlands	sieto.verver@wur.nl
Jarno Virtanen	Joint Research Centre (IPSC)	Via E. Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra, Italy	jarno.virtanen@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Ireneusz Wojcik	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute	Kollataja 1, 81-332 Gdynia Poland	iwojcik@mir.gdynia.pl
Observers			
Degnbol Poul	ICES	H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	poul.degnbol@ices.dk
Holdsworth Neil	ICES	H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 DK-1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	neil.holdsworth@ices.dk
De Rossi Federico	GFCM	Palazzo Blumenstihl, Via Vittoria Colonna 1 Rome 00193	Federico.DeRossi@fao.org
European Commission			
Garzon Isabelle	DG MARE		Isabelle.Garzon@ec.europa.eu

			a.eu
Knapp Amelie	DG MARE		Amelie.KNAPP@ec.europa.eu
Ranner Herwig	DG MARE		Herwig.RANNER@ec.europa.eu
Jarno Virtanen	Joint Research Centre, STECF Secretariat	Via E. Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra, Italy	jarno.virtanen@jrc.ec.europa.eu
JRC expert			
Jarno Virtanen	Joint Research Centre (IPSC)	Via E. Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra, Italy	jarno.virtanen@jrc.ec.europa.eu

ANNEX 4 – LIST OF KEY BACKGROUND DOCUMENTATION

Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 of 25 February 2008 concerning the establishment of a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy

Commission Regulation (EC) No 665/2008 of 14 July 2008 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 concerning the establishment of a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy

2008/949/EC Commission Decision of 6 November 2008 adopting a multiannual Community programme pursuant to Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 establishing a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the common fisheries policy

ICES (2008) Joint STECF/ICES Workshop on Implementation Studies on Concurrent Length Sampling

Draft Report of the 8th Liaison Meeting - Meeting between the Chairs of the RCMs, the chair of ICES PGCCDBS, the chair of PGMED, the ICES representative, the Chairs of STECF DCF EWG's and the European Commission. Brussels, October 2011.

STECF 11-04 - Reflections on the Present and Future Requirements of the DCF. Brussels, March 2011.

ANNEX 5 – QUESTIONS TO ASSIST REVIEW OF REVISED NP

EWG 11-19 Review of Revised 2012 NP

TEMPLATE

Report from each Each Sub Group

14 Member States Revisions to 2012 NP

(Part 1) SPREADSHEET FOR ALL YOUR SUB GROUP COUNTRIES/ECONOMICS

- Complete Spreadsheet for your Countries/Economic
- These will be merged in Report
- State on spreadsheet if revisions are Minor (M) or Substantial (S)

(PART 2) TEXT – FOR EACH COUNTRY

- Describe each Revision (1 to X)
- State if Revision Minor or Substantial (will it change NP and have financial implications)
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Justified and improves the NP
- Give Expert Opinion if Revision is Acceptable by MS

In reviewing revisions; please use Annex 5 Questions from Evaluation of 2011-2013 NP from SGRN Report 10-01 Ispra June 2010.

(Part 3) GENERAL COMMENTS

- Give any general Comments that emerged during your discussions
- e.g. Respected Guidelines; LM, RCM Recommendations
- Recommendations on how to improve the Process

NB - Economic Sub Group will Conver Trans. Var.

ANNEX 6 – Roadmap for EWG 11-19

STECF EWG 11-19; Meeting Roadmap

Mon 28 th Nov	Travel	Meeting Objectives, Logistics TOR's, Agenda, Roadmap Views of the Commission Meeting Report Formation of Sub Groups Rapporteurs	Sub Group Work On Review of 2012 NP (TOR 1) 3pm to 6pm	
Tues 29 th Nov	Sub Groups - Work On Review of 2012 NP (TOR 1) @ 9am to 3pm		A First Report of Sub Group Chairs Presentation from Sub Group 1 General Comments - Discussion @ 3pm to 4.30pm (TOR 1)	
Wed 30 th Nov	Report of Sub Groups Chairs Recommendations Issues that Emerged (TOR 1) 10am to 12pm	DCF Comments by STECF Comments by 8 th LM (TOR 3 and 4) @ 12pm to 1pm	Views of the Commission @2pm Brainstorm - Performance of DCF since 2008 Views of Major Data End Users (ICES ; GFCM) Key Changes required in post 2013 DCF (TOR 2)	
Thurs 1 st Dec	SWOT of DCF (TOR 2) Proposed Meetings in 2012 (TOR 6)	Regional Data Bases Review Progress (TOR 5) Presentation by ICES	Rapporteurs Prepare Text For Report	A First Look at the Draft Report Review Meeting Recommendations For each TOR Have we Addressed our TOR's ? Concluding Comments

European Commission

EUR 25308 – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) - Review of the Revised 2012 National Programmes and on the Future of the DCF (STECF-12-02).

STECF members: Casey, J., Abella, J. A., Andersen, J., Bailey, N., Bertignac, M., Cardinale, M., Curtis, H., Daskalov, G., Delaney, A., Döring, R., Garcia Rodriguez, M., Gascuel, D., Graham, N., Gustavsson, T., Jennings, S., Kenny, A., Kirkegaard, E., Kraak, S., Kuikka, S., Malvarosa, L., Martin, P., Motova, A., Murua, H., Nord, J., Nowakowski, P., Prellezo, R., Sala, A., Scarcella, G., Simmonds, J., Somarakis, S., Stransky, C., Theret, F., Ulrich, C., Vanhee, W. & Van Oostenbrugge, H.

EWG-11-19 members: Connolly P, Armesto A, Carpentieri P, Dalskov J, Dias M, Ebeling M, Goti L, Vigneau J, Gravino F, Kazlauskas E, Koutrakis E, Leskelä A, Ni Chonchúir G, Radu G, Raid T, Ringdahl K, Schön P-J, Statkus R, Stroe C, Torreele E, Vassallo D, Verver S, Virtanen J, Wojcik I.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2012 – 87 pp. – 21.0 x 29.7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1831-9424 (online), ISSN 1018-5593 (print)

ISBN 978-92-79-24795-8

doi:10.2788/25202

Abstract

STECF Expert Working Group 11-19 that was held from 28th November to 1st December 2012 in Brussels (Belgium). The main objectives of the meeting were to evaluate the Member States National programs for 2012 and review the future needs in revision of data collection regulation. STECF reviewed the report during its Plenary meeting on 16-20 April 2012 in Brussels.

How to obtain EU publications

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

As the Commission's in-house science service, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to provide EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support throughout the whole policy cycle.

Working in close cooperation with policy Directorates-General, the JRC addresses key societal challenges while stimulating innovation through developing new standards, methods and tools, and sharing and transferring its know-how to the Member States and international community.

Key policy areas include: environment and climate change; energy and transport; agriculture and food security; health and consumer protection; information society and digital agenda; safety and security including nuclear; all supported through a cross-cutting and multi-disciplinary approach.

The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) has been established by the European Commission. The STECF is being consulted at regular intervals on matters pertaining to the conservation and management of living aquatic resources, including biological, economic, environmental, social and technical considerations.